

Chapter 1

Cosmopolitan Politics

Making a Case for Systemic Praxis

1.1 Introduction: Earth Democracy and Earth Governance

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, we see modern society with new eyes, and this birth of a ‘cosmopolitan vision’ (Beck 2006) is among the unexpected phenomena out of which a still indeterminate world of risk society is emerging. Henceforth, there are no merely local occurrences. All genuine threats have become global threats. The situation of every nation, every people, every religion, every class and every individual is also the result and cause of the human situation. The key point is that henceforth concern about the whole has become a task. It is not optional but the human condition. (Beck 2009, p. 19)

Entangled social, economic and environmental challenges posed by food, energy and water shortages require a revision of compartmentalist or containerist approaches limited to the nation state and informed by failed enlightenment agendas (McIntyre-Mills et al. 2006a). As Eyerman (1981, p. 55) stressed, false consciousness refers to:

an experience in society, ideology to a proposed or offered explanation of that experience. One however that only further distorted real understanding. As these questions developed within the Frankfurt School during these years of emigration and exile, the problem of how real understanding was at all possible, became the central one.

As the experience of suffering becomes more widespread, the notion of class will become central once again, because ‘the poorest people in the world will be the hardest hit’ (Beck 2009, p. 37).

Global citizenship ought to become a concept supported by international law and social justice movements (McIntyre-Mills 2000). Change requires necessity, desire and will (see Bogue 1989 on Deleuze and Guattari). The goal of this research with local government—inspired by the Aboriginal mentors (McIntyre-Mills and de Vries 2011)—is to foster an understanding that ‘We are the land’ (Getano Lui 1993).¹

¹ Dualistic thinking needs to be recognized as part of a failed enlightenment project and we need to ‘rescue the enlightenment from itself’ (McIntyre-Mills et al. 2006a) through recognizing our co-determination of the environment of which we are a part.

The problem that cosmopolitanism addresses is that the most vulnerable people, the voiceless and future generations of life, are not protected by the social contract.

But can cosmopolitan politics address the criticism raised by the Left, namely that the pseudo-debate between the Right and the Left leads to a transformation of the neoliberal market (see Habermas 2010)?

The area of concern addressed by cosmopolitans is that humanity faces systemically linked social, economic and environmental crises that currently pose a challenge to the sovereignty of states.

The chapter aims to give the reader an understanding of the way in which cosmopolitanism (like all social concepts) is shaped by diverse definitions and applied very differently by theorists and those who engage in transformative praxis.

Weak and strong cosmopolitans share in common a sense of the need to address universal human rights to quality of life.

Some develop theoretical arguments that rest on moral and legal arguments; others engage in participatory research projects that review, pilot or perform transformations. Others engage in everyday activism to address issues as they arise pertaining to exploitation and violence towards the less powerful, racism, sexism, speciesism and homophobia.

The case will be made that with the development of new forms of digital communication it may be possible to enable broader participation in a wider public space, without undermining the role of the state—albeit within a so-called Republican federalism.

Linklater (1999, p. 473) strongly links cosmopolitanism with social justice, in order to address the rights of those who are not protected by states:

The strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must, boldly expresses the realist theme...

Firstly, the chapter aims to give the reader an understanding of the way in which cosmopolitanism (like all social concepts) is shaped by diverse definitions and applied very differently by theorists and those who engage in transformative praxis. The problem that cosmopolitanism addresses is that the most vulnerable people (including the voiceless and future generations) are not protected by the social contract. But can cosmopolitan politics address the criticism raised by the Left, namely that politics needs to strive for a debate that ensures the pseudo-politics (of Right and Left in capitalist society) leads to a transformation of the neoliberal market?

The area of concern addressed by cosmopolitans is that humanity faces a systemically linked social, economic and environmental crisis that currently poses a challenge to sovereign states (Shrivastava 2008).

Some cosmopolitans engage in everyday activism to address social and environmental justice issues as they arise pertaining to human rights such as safe, sustainable food, energy and water supplies.

Others stress the need to address animal rights, such as animal husbandry, the transportation of animals and cruel slaughtering practices.

Secondly, the chapter aims to give the reader a sense of the arguments for and against a weak versus a strong cosmopolitanism. It develops an argument based on considering the empirical consequences of social, economic and environmental decisions on the quality of life of current and future generations. In response to critical theorists and realists, it develops an ethical argument based on considering rights, responsibilities and empirical evidence, in order to address why strong cosmopolitanism is not merely a discourse of the weak. It considers the inadequacy of the nation-based social contract to address the wide-ranging consequences of consumption on the quality of life of future generations.

The chapter sums up the literature on systemic approaches to the vexed challenge of how to bridge the false dualism of pitting the environment versus profit (Charlton 2011).

Governance and democracy approaches that polarize the planet and profit miss the point that it is possible to reframe development designs to address risk and resilience. It addresses the essential question of how to “reconcile universalistic principles of human rights, autonomy, and freedom with our concrete identity as members of certain human communities divided by language, by ethnicity, by religion” (Benhabib 2004).

Thirdly, it makes a case for developing cosmopolitan approaches based on local engagement that enables monitoring ‘from below’. The process of monitoring needs to be supported by means of the principle of subsidiarity and buttressed by international law.

How do we engage people so that they are willing to act as stewards? If we hope to achieve conscious evolution and we do not wish to rely on chance, then we need to find ways to engage local people in thinking through the implications of their choices.² Removing incentives to profit at the expense of others and the environment. The possible responses include an earth charter that reforms the market through reframing what we measure.

Valuing perceptions of people on what constitutes wellbeing, based on the axiom that people ought to have the right to be free and diverse to the extent that their freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others or future generations of life. Unlike Sen, the case needs to be made for the need to develop capabilities not just of the poor in developing countries but Wall Street managers. Accountability needs to be extended through increased monitoring from above and below to address time dimension across generations and the need to develop stocks for the future, based on praxis that does not polarize the planet versus production. Wellbeing could be measured carefully by adapting the ideas outlined by Murray et al. (2006, p. 16, 2007) and Stiglitz (2010). So-called midpoint measures of basic needs for a liveable lifestyle can be developed at a local level to form the basis of scaled-up ‘end point

² Global covenants could provide a way forward. They could help to enable people to think about the social contract beyond the nation state. But the challenge remains, how do we scale up interventions? Currently, the financial crises are also being poorly managed. Clearly, if the EU is to survive it needs to be supported by a means to balance individual and national interests with the collective good of the union. More and more members of the union are disenchanted for a number of reasons.

measures' such as length of life and loss of life. The common metaphor is the global footprint which is widely understood to have implications for others—including the voiceless and sentient beings. But it does not provide the means to ensure its implementation.³

1.1.1 Ethics, Consumption and Governance

Joy Murray et al. (2006, 2007) developed the Tuvalu Test and asks to what extent do nations trample on the rights of others by shortening their life span?⁴ Physicists and economists will need to work together if we are to respond to the Stern Review (2006) on the economics of climate change, then dramatic changes in what we value need to be modelled through markets that are guided by overarching covenants to ensure that the size of the carbon footprint is indeed addressed.

1.2 Cosmopolitanism and Options for Cosmopolitan Citizenship

Cosmopolitan citizenship recognizes the relevance of Hannah Arendt's notion that evil comes about because of a lack of vigilance, a lack of criticism and a lack of action or agency by people who could make a difference.

Arguments by idealists, pragmatists and realists differ. A way to bridge the divides is discussed through expanding pragmatism to consider the consequences for current and future generations through addressing wellbeing and developing governance systems to ensure that stocks for the future are developed through limiting the way in which production processes and distribution practices benefit the minority at the expense of the majority. Young people (Osler and Starkey 2005), the disabled,

³ The problem with end-point measures is that it requires law and the will to implement overarching law via federations buttressed by example the Lisbon Treaty (Horvath and Odor 2010) which requires that social, economic and environmental legal considerations be met. Unfortunately, the structural and process mechanisms of the EU are not able to manage the distribution of funding or to apply the principle of additionality successfully (Rhodes 1997).

⁴ What midpoint indicators such as decreasing biodiversity and rising sea levels, (see Murray et al. 2006, pp. 14–16) can be developed to ensure that we live in ways that do not shorten the life of others and that do not lead to loss of life? The choices for local wellbeing have an implication for the wider region, which is why these choices should be transparent. How could this be achieved? Whistle-blowing is necessary before and not only after the horse has bolted. How do we prevent problems through monitoring on a regular basis? Could enabling people at the local level (through the principle of subsidiarity) address the concerns for access to information? How do we engage people so that they are willing to act as stewards? If we hope to achieve conscious evolution and we do not wish to rely on chance, then we need to find ways to engage local people in thinking through the implications of their choices.

asylum seekers (Yeatman 2003)⁵ and sentient beings (Nussbaum 2006) along with future generations live ‘precarious lives’ (Butler 2005). Those perceived as different are not protected (Young 1990).

The concept of cosmopolitanism refers to the notion that human beings are citizens of the world who ought to extend hospitality to one another; the ability to see one another as part of one human family is of course not the preserve of the western thinking. The stoic Diogenes, a freed slave, said pithily that he was ‘a citizen of the world’ and that the ‘morally good are all friends’ and that ‘he could not be defined by a city state’, but ‘only in relation to the cosmos’ (Brown and Held 2010, p. 3). Whereas the stoics and humanist arguments stress the ability to reason as the distinction of human consciousness from that of animals, current cosmopolitans see humanity as caretakers of all life and stress the relationships to others and the land as vital for the common good. Jenneth Parker of the Schumacher Institute makes a distinction between green and sustainable approaches that are not anthropocentric. She poses the question “hould we strive for a ‘green or a sustainability movement’?”⁶ and argues that we need to be careful of placing the earth above people without thinking about the implications. Ecological humanism needs to enable people to live elegant simple and ethical lives. Transformation to reframe economics rests on transformation of our views on property (Drahos 2005) and our stewardship through reducing consumption of some resources and the development of others. This has implications for codes of personal, interpersonal and public conduct. Thus, the new cosmopolitan perspective develops a respect for the global commons as the basis for all life.

The ability to make and remake connections in the brain—neurogenesis—has been raised by Baroness Professor Susan Greenfield (2000, 2008). Thinking in small compartments and stress stunts creativity. But more importantly, it could leave us disadvantaged in the evolutionary stakes. Greenfield stresses the plasticity of the human brain and its ability to respond creatively to challenges.⁷ The zom-

⁵ ‘Customs may not look for asylum seeker’s bodies Customs officials may not attempt to recover the bodies of up to 55 asylum seekers thought to have drowned off Christmas Island, angering refugee advocates’. See Financial Review, 11 June 2013. http://www.afr.com/p/national/customs_may_not_look_for_asylum_ifpaZYn2WxZbs2P1JrZRof.

⁶ <http://vimeo.com/album/2066366/video/4750629727> January 2013.

⁷ At a recent conference on creating the future in Melbourne, November 2012, Prof. Susan Greenfield summed up the issue of the plasticity of the brain, meaning that the brain makes neural connections; the more connections, the more mindful we become. The making of connections is personal. It is the result of our personal experiences, so even two identical twins will have the potential to develop different connections as a result of their experiences. To what extent can the use of conceptual tools enable us to extend our sense of the world and to enable us to see ourselves as members of a wider group to whom we are responsible and with whom we have solidarity? Can leadership that fosters ‘neurogenesis’ or making of connections make a difference—or is it all about power and the will to power? Although activities like playing the piano will help to develop new neural connections, even thinking about playing can develop these connections. So the idea behind this research was that perhaps by getting people to think differently about the way in which they live, and to consider, what if I were to do things differently, perhaps it will enable the participants who do these mental exercises, to transform the way in which they live. I did this research

bie mindset of stumbling forward relentlessly is cause for concern. Do the zombie marchers in Prague or Chicago or London understand why they are marching, or is it just a mindless fad?

1.3 Extending the Case for Strong Cosmopolitanism

If citizens do not have the capability to speak out and if they do not have a voice, then governments cannot be held to account. The challenge for strong cosmopolitans is to recognize the design challenge for engaging people in agoras spanning the local, regional, national and post-national regional level. Without the ability of people to have a say on issues they care about, democracy does indeed break down. So where does this leave us? Social and environmental justice needs to be protected, but what happens when local sovereign states do not protect the rights of citizens? What happens when elected leaders are without responsibility and are hopelessly corrupt?

If the corruption occurs within the British government (as highlighted in exposures of the misuse of public funds for personal expenses⁸) and MPs are held up to the scrutiny of an informed public, they will be criticized and held to account by a range of digital media. Freedom ensures that even when mainstream media are controlled by the state or the market, people find alternative ways to express themselves (Cruddas 2013). Regime change through social movements, however, always needs to be guided by democratic norms. The aporia faced by all democracies is that they can only exist within the rule of law, supported by just governance institutions.

The argument strives to make the case that polarizing idealism versus pragmatic realism is based on simplistic reasoning. Those who are voiceless by virtue of their age, gender, culture, level of ability and nationality can be excluded by the state. The gaze of the panopticon state protects only those who qualify within specific boundaries to rights. The rest fall outside this mantle. For example,

...the citizens of the Third World have become ‘the exception of the world’ (Agamben, 179–81). In their misery and exclusion, they are turned into depoliticized objects of the global liberal gaze and governance. (cited by Beardsworth 2010, p. 182).

By extension, only some forms of life fall under the mantle of the anthropocentric state. This has implications not only for sustainability but also for quality of life of intermeshed species. The Marxist critique of cosmopolitans rests on the need to address the means of production and poverty. The emphasis on governance and ethical

first with people with complex health, housing and social inclusion needs. Many were addressing unemployment and had a range of associated needs and health-related problems—including recovering from drug-related and other alcohol-related illnesses. Addiction to a way of life can be both a cause and the effect of many other problems, as Stafford Beer (1974) stressed in his research. This is why the approach to research needs to be one of engagement and being the change.

⁸ MPs’ expenses in detail, 2009 as on Friday, 19 June 2009. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/8039273.stm. Accessed 6/02/2013.

rhetoric without action to redistribute resources or forgive debt is a point well taken. Nevertheless, the strong cosmopolitan response meets these criticisms and stresses that for world poverty to be addressed transnational action and governance will be necessary to ensure that resources are used fairly. Protection of the common good and to enhance social, economic and environmental wellbeing is vital.⁹

Critical, feminist and environmentalist critiques of weak cosmopolitanism stress the importance of considering the consequences for the most vulnerable.¹⁰ Cosmopolitan citizenship is based on the axiom that freedom and diversity ought to be fostered to support wellbeing and creativity, but only to the extent that the rights of others and the next generation of life are respected.¹¹

This is vital for developing a sense of solidarity, rather than fragmentation, but the next step is to develop compassion based on an understanding that we are people through others (Ramphele 2012) and we need to develop participatory democracy to hold those who govern us to account, not merely in the nation state, but internationally. This requires a change of heart and a realization that we need to define ourselves not in terms of what we have, but in terms of being the change, to draw on Fanon and Gandhi. Strong cosmopolitanism can be summed up as rooted in many kinds of knowledge, in order to: (a) *decentre* anthropocentrism (Mathews 1991, 2010; Rose 1996, 2004, 2005, Rose and Dooren 2010; Wynne 2009) and (b) address the social, cultural and economic crisis and environmental crisis through greater critical awareness and solidarity with others (see McIntyre-Mills 2010a).

The challenge is to: *promote an ever extending or widening circle of solidarity in order to care for* the next generation of life. It also requires the creation of new global narratives arising out of a cross-pollination of spiritual ideas from a range of religious and spiritual practices. This appreciation of narratives could inform discursive engagement to help establish ethical processes to support wellbeing at

⁹ 'A radical shift in the way in which the planet as a whole supplies and uses energy is obviously necessary. The shift to a low carbon economy presents an extraordinary challenge to the planet as a whole...' (Beardsworth 2010, p. 164).

¹⁰ According to Benhabib (2008): 'We extend the boundaries of our sympathy by understanding the conditions of others who may be radically different than us...'

¹¹ The axiom to guide and balance new forms of democracy and governance is that we can be free and diverse at a local, national or transnational regional level to the extent that we do not undermine the collective good (Eder 1996; McIntyre-Mills 2010) or the global commons. Initially, the concept of global commons was narrowly defined as 'assets outside the national frontiers such as oceans, space and the Antarctic'. OECD definition <http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/search.asp>. Our area of concern is the extent to which resilience could be achieved through attitudinal and behavioural change fostered through participatory democracy and systemic governance that incorporates structured 'if then considerations' (Christakis and Bausch 2006; McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011) to develop clear priorities as to how to respond to contextual challenges (Ng 2011). The theme of global stewardship, democracy and governance frameworks to support wellbeing is addressed in this program of research by asking questions guided by a design of inquiring systems (DIS) adapted from the work of West Churchman (1979, 1982), McIntyre-Mills (2006 a, b, c, 2010), McIntyre-Mills and De Vries (2011). The DIS refers to addressing an area of concern by 'unfolding' human values and 'sweeping in' contextual considerations and many domains of knowledge spanning logic, empiricism, idealism, the dialectic and pragmatism before making any decision.

a post-national level. This requires discursive engagement as well as participatory governance to enable accountability and whistleblowing on the misuse of power or resources (McIntyre-Mills 2012):

The narrow cost benefit approach that lies behind uncontrolled economic exploitation of the environment also poses problems for the laudable goals of intergenerational responsibility and equity included in the idea of sustainable development (Haydon 2010, p. 357).

The defence is that a universalist approach needs to be seen as differentiated to respond to the contextual needs of people with different life chances, according to Archibugi (2008). This critical systemic argument goes beyond merely arguing for a 'resources tax' (Pogge 2001), or a new architecture for governance—it strives for cultural transformation of the state and the market through global governance to ensure the fair and equitable use of resources, in order to protect the global commons and the common good.

The challenge is not merely to balance growth and equity; it is to develop responsive accounting and accountability that is guided by people who use scaled-up participation from the local municipal level, to the national, regional and global level. Reinvention is needed, rather than a mere extension of democracy or social democracy as we currently understand it. This will require more openness to the creativity of local cultures and prevention of the neoliberal market that allows the patents of powerful companies or multinationals to undermine the property rights of others.

A mix of policy approaches is needed that are applied according to the needs of different levels. This is the essence of what Held argues but the details need to be carefully worked out through praxis informed by those who are to be affected by the decisions.

Nussbaum reframes and reconceptualises the implications for the bounded approaches to addressing the wellbeing of those who are not protected by the social contract between the state and its citizens. Wellbeing is defined in broad terms of quality of life and the capability to engage and develop one's human or species capability. Thus, the argument developed by Nussbaum can be used to develop explanatory purchase as to why international governance is vital for human rights and for the protection of citizens who can only be protected through overlapping state agreements that do not operate along the lines of a zero-sum approach. Nussbaum argues that wellbeing of the voiceless needs to be protected and that the social contract in the Rawlsian sense does not protect the vulnerable. Asylum seekers and young people are unable to express democratic rights and are reliant on others.

Onora O'Neill (1975/1999) stresses the complicity of developed nations towards less developed nations, because their economy has profited by their losses. Strong cosmopolitans advocate a broadening of governance that is subject to checks and balances through international institutions. They argue that the city state is no longer a relevant basis for democracy and governance.¹² Dahl's notion that democracy is

¹² Beck (2009, 2010), for example, stresses the need for social movements to raise awareness to support social and environmental justice and stresses that the nation state is inadequate. He has stressed the so-called boomerang effect of poverty and pollution in risk society and later developed a more nuanced discussion of the implications of energy use and climate change. O'Neill, for

only possible when people can participate in elections on issues of relevance to them breaks down when we are confronted with the undeniable reality that people face convergent challenges in increasingly dense, diverse, cosmopolitan cities. Quality of life is affected by access to food, energy and water in cities that are unlikely to be sustainable, unless they are supported by sustainable agricultural policies that serve educated populations who have the right and the capability to engage in the political debate. Citizens who are educated and have a decent quality of life are able to engage in debate and able to vote on issues of concern. Democracy within overlapping regions is able to muster social movements that shape the political agendas. New forms of governance and democracy are possible today that enable voting for candidates, selection of candidates as well as keeping elected candidates on track.¹³

It is undeniable that deepening democracy requires openness; transparency at multiple levels and in cross-cutting regions governed by the principle of subsidiarity, namely that decisions need to be made at the lowest possible level, is a vital antidote to the concerns raised by Dahl concerning relevance or salience of issues. The elephant in the room that politicians dare not name—except in the name of xenophobia or the unpopular one child policy¹⁴ that has recently been repealed—could

example, follows in the footsteps of Buckminster Fuller in using the concept of ‘spaceship earth’. Their critical systemic analysis makes a case for the complicity of those who support business as usual. The fate of humanity cannot be protected by boundaries. Not only are social, economic and environmental boundaries porous, we have responsibilities for space ship earth, to cite Buckminster Fuller. Rights need to be protected by responsible global governance that is accountable to overlapping regionalist institutions.

¹³ The notion of isolated city states with small, static populations is no longer relevant. Democracy and governance needs to develop to respond to current challenges. The notion that democracy serves the interests of humanity at the expense of the environment is simply unsustainable. The notion that elected governments serve the people who elect them as their agents needs to be expanded to accept that the rights of elected governments and the people they serve need to be expanded to consider the rights of future generations of life. The responsibility of the people (the principles) is to this generation and the next. This notion can be summed up as strong cosmopolitanism based on the idea of post-national governance in overlapping regions aimed at balancing both rights and responsibilities to others and the environment. The planet is not a credit card to be used to benefit some, whilst others pick up the tab! The responsibility weighs differently on developed and less developed nations and also differently on the rich and poor, this generation and the next. The architecture of governance (Archibugi 2008) needs to respond to environmental needs that protect the wellbeing of global citizens (Haydon 2010). Sovereign nation states need to consider regional rights and responsibilities in a series of overlapping organisations that apply the rule of law to ensure equitable and fair distribution of rights and responsibilities for food, energy and water. The research is about developing post-national organizations to ensure human rights. Disaster management, movement of people fleeing disaster or injustice and securing food, energy and water are concerns that span boundaries (spatial, conceptual and temporal). We need to solve problems across generations, across disciplines and across nation states to create good neighbourhoods. This requires trust and better communication so that we understand one another better. It requires compassion at best, but if rights are accorded to the powerless, then those without compassion will be required to limit their actions.

¹⁴ <http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/Fall07/Henneberger/History.html>, accessed, 2/01/2014.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/28/chinas-one-child-policy-is-eased-in-greatest-reform-for-three-decades>. China’s Associated Press, Beijing. “China on Saturday formally allowed couples to have a second child if one parent is an only child, the first major easing of its

be addressed through ensuring that human beings across the planet are educated and empowered. Amartya Sen and Nussbaum argue that development leads to freedom, rising living standards and to lowering population rates. The demographic transition needs to be achieved through wide-ranging development and distribution of resources. Realists will counter that this is absurd, because capitalism in its current form can only be sustained through expanding markets based on extracting profit from workers and the environment.

The critical and systemic thinkers however argue that this breaks down, because markets cannot continue to expand in the current form. The technocratic response is that human creativity will prevail. To a certain extent this is a viable argument, but all designs need to be mindful that the environment is primary and that designs need to ensure that they protect the web of life, rather than pitting profit versus the planet. Quality of life to support wellbeing needs to be achieved through new measures and new forms of accounting and accountability, based on social, cultural, political, economic and environmental measures that are sustainable.

Governance needs to be buttressed by new forms of accounting that will enable the market to be monitored in ways that respect and support the environment.

Measuring environmental expenditures at the local level and ensuring equitable access and distribution can only occur when the notion of property is reconceptualised. If the constitutions of nation states accept that the global commons needs to include the bases of life, namely water in rivers and oceans, earth and the microbes that support it, seeds and the responsibility to protect seeds and ecological diversity and the right to protect future generations from unsustainable levels of carbon and unsustainable temperature rises, then all nations will need to accept that it is in their interests to protect the common good.

In America, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has attempted to introduce nationwide smog standards, but the Petroleum Institute has lobbied for delay. In Australia, the carbon tax was feared by those affected by the rising costs. The narrow pragmatism of nations needs to be addressed through expanding an understanding of the consequences of their decisions, based on dialogue informed by empirical facts, namely that with a rise in global warming beyond 2 °C it is more than likely that the quality of life for all will be compromised. The deadlock cannot be resolved through political appeasement within sovereign democracies.

The argument made by strong cosmopolitans is that democracy and governance need to be reconceptualised. Dahl and Kymlicka (2001) would argue that post-national decision cannot be democratic and that the actions taken by international organizations may be necessary to protect the global commons, but on a democratic continuum based on indicators of democracy that require being informed, capable and with the ability to begin a debate, this form of democracy will score so low that it is debatable that it can be called democracy. Bohmann (2005, p. 112) is critical of

3-decade-old restrictive birth policy. First announced by the ruling Communist Party's leadership in November, the decision was officially sanctioned by the standing committee of China's top legislature, the National People's Congress, the official Xinhua News Agency reported." <http://www.theguardian.com/au>. Accessed 2/01/2014.

democracy as a means to support global justice; he asks: “Could the distribution of universal political rights create the conditions for the democratic minimum across borders?”¹⁵ He stresses that imperialism needs to be avoided and, like Benhabib and Archibugi, stresses that instead we need a form of federalist Republicanism.

Bohman (2005, p. 111 and 102) stresses Arendt’s concept of ‘the capacity to begin a democratic dialogue’, but:

For democracy to promote justice, it must already be just. Call this the democratic circle. While it can never be said to disappear, the circle can become virtuous through what I refer to as the ‘democratic minimum’: the achievement of a democratic arrangement sufficient for citizens to exercise their creative powers to re-shape democracy according to the demands of justice—that is the capacity to initiate democratic deliberation.

Strong cosmopolitans such as Archibugi (2010, p. 319) stress the need for global democracy to support global governance by means of a constitution spanning nation states and thus creating ‘overlapping spheres of power’. Just as decisions are made at the nation state level by legal systems buttressed by constitutional law:

At the global level, similar institutions should also have the task of deciding on the decision-making clout of the stakeholders and of assigning competencies (Archibugi 2010, p. 320).

Unlike the federalist or confederal model, Archibugi argues that global constitutions replace sovereignty at the national level and instead of ‘one state one vote,’ the principle of ‘one individual one vote’ prevails for global citizens. Archibugi envisages that citizens and their governments would participate in decisions and that an international court would make decisions and that ‘the member states would accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the international courts.’ Archibugi stresses that each state would ‘retain their own armed forces,’ but that humanitarian interventions could draw on the resources of many states and could be ‘managed by cosmopolitan institutions.’ According to Dean (2009), the Marxist argument against cosmopolitanism is that normative and legal arguments are inadequate to address the class inequalities within and between nation states. The cosmopolitan response is one of promoting social democracy and redistribution of energy resources through governance. The Marshall Plan approach is suggested by Chevalier (2009) as a possible response to the energy crisis.

The problem is that that the greatest emitters such as USA need to accept their responsibility to developing nations who need to consider development as a way out of poverty.

In the light of the above, how then can we develop a way forward to create transnational webs of shared meaning that are buttressed by governance to protect the global commons and the public good? Held proposed that the core challenges of the day are to address the vast differences in the standard of living between the rich and the poor through reforming world trade and through using the market to address global warming by means of a global covenant that prevents unilateral interventions.

¹⁵ Also see the article by Carens (1987) entitled: ‘Aliens and Citizens’ and cited in *The rights of Minority cultures*, Ed Kymlicka, W. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

The right of the minority elites to exploit others does need to be curtailed. Bond argues that more social movements are needed ‘from below,’ as a result of his experience with trade union movements in South Africa (SA). He stresses that the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) laws were only addressed in SA through marches and not by the state.

Desai (London School of Economics) argues for post-statist social democracy based on governance from below, based on the:

erosion of state sovereignty and the strengthening of human rights independently of nation states. The days when statism was any sort of answer to humanity’s problems are past. Certainly not global statism! (Desai 2005, p. 69)

Held responds to his critics by arguing that he accepts post-sovereignty and networks and those tools such as the Internet and co-operations of NGOs need to develop future governance. Desai’s arguments rest on accepting that people will move to find jobs and that multinational companies will eventually have more power than nation states and they will “demand a uniform standard of environmental or accounting practices, in order to operate across the world” (Desai 2005, p. 69).

People will need to change the world from below, but the question remains how to balance individual and collective rights? The debate that began earlier in 2004 reveals how many of the points of criticism are correct. Thompson (2005) stressed that the US economy is fragile and that assuming that the Washington Consensus and security agenda should be the starting point for discussion is problematic! In some ways, it is hubris.

The market failures Held (2005, p. 15) anticipates fall short of what has actually occurred. The problem is not only concerning externalities that are not factored into calculations of the degradation to the environment, it is a way of thinking and ‘being in the world’ that shifts the extraction of profit to where labour is cheaper and where governments and citizens are less likely to complain about degradation of environment. Short-term profits are made at the expense of future generations. This undermines the conditions of employment so that full-time employment becomes less available. The globalized market needs post-national controls to ensure control of the movement funds (see McIntyre-Mills 2011). Enabling the transformation of identity through governance and public education is the challenge for ethical systemic governance. This has become increasingly difficult as governments focus on political survival, rather than addressing the social, economic and environmental crises. Morality becomes politically disposable, because of a lack of understanding of our interconnected existence.

Strong cosmopolitans recognize that the need to contain capitalism. Our so-called containment anxiety, linked with our identity and need to define ourselves, cannot be addressed by living a schizophrenic existence in which we see ourselves as benefitting at the expense of other nation states. We already have regional conflicts fuelled by energy shortages and competition for the last of the non-renewables. Satellite monitoring from above seems to be more of a priority at the moment by USA than space travel. Digital communications are already widely used, but their potential is untapped as stressed in this chapter and other research on wellbeing, representation, accountability and sustainability (McIntyre-Mills and de Vries 2011).

The greatest challenges are the consequences of inaction that will potentially pose an existential risk to humanity. These challenges include representation of the increasingly diverse populations within nation states along with accountability to ensure that resources (e.g. water, food and energy) are used fairly, equitably and sustainably in local and regional biospheres. Better forms of engagement are needed to enhance the capability of people to understand that attitudes towards consumption have profound implications for social and environmental justice.

Cosmopolitan engagement needs to help participants to consider the potential consequences of their choices. These approaches span narrative (to explore complexity and to enable a creative flow of ideas), dialogue and questioning to reformulate boundaries. Scenarios were also explored spanning ‘business as usual,’ ‘small steps towards a sustainable future’ and achieving a sustainable future through building up ‘wellbeing stocks’ (Stiglitz et al. 2010).

Stiglitz (2010), the ex-head of the World Bank, along with his colleagues has adopted similar ideas based on his experiences in response to an invitation from Sarkozy to address the poverty and global financial issues facing Europe. It recognizes the systemic social, economic and environmental challenges. Stiglitz et al. (2011, p. 15) use a multidimensional measure of wellbeing. These are as follows: (1) material living standards (income, consumption and wealth), (2) health, (3) education, (4) personal activities including work, (5) political voice and governance, (6) social connections and relationships, (7) environment (present and future conditions) and (8) insecurity, of an economy as well as a physical nature. Leisure should also be valued. According to Stiglitz et al., the essence of the commission’s findings is that wealth needs to include stocks for the future—these are social, economic and environmental. Together with vulnerability to job loss, many people across the world also face risks associated with fires, flood and drought.¹⁶

If all measures were to be considered, then wellbeing in median households could provide a benchmark to guide policy standards. Consumption, wealth and income could be compared across rich and poor households.¹⁷ Arguments for and against the national, transnational and supranational organizations have been raised by idealists, pragmatists and realists. A way to bridge the divides is through expanding pragmatism to consider the consequences for current and future generations through addressing wellbeing and developing governance systems to ensure that stocks for

¹⁶ Conservative economists argue that consumption can be modified by those with an income to build up wealth. The difference in this report is that consumption refers to stocks that are usually not included in economic measures. The most important point made is that by contributing to the public good, individual households could enhance their wellbeing. In Australia, households that were protected by levee banks weathered the recent floods in South Wales. State governments that levy taxes to build resilient communities are providing for the common good. Reducing consumption in order to pay taxes to protect our homes and families makes sense as New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland continue to count the costs of flooding in Australia.

¹⁷ It is possible for measures of average to disguise the fact that a high income does not enable exhausted workers to enjoy the same kind of leisure that a lower-income family enjoys who has access to the safety net of capital, a home (rather than a mortgage) and the security that loss of income will not lead to a loss of their home or their social networks.

the future are developed through limiting the way in which production processes and distribution practices benefit the minority at the expense of the majority.

A sustainable local community is determined by a sustainable region in which food, energy and water supplies are considered as major determinants for well-being. No community can be expected to transform from a high-carbon lifestyle (or aspiring to this lifestyle) without feeling part of the design process and owning the decisions as to how resources should be used.

Young people (Osler and Starkeyb 2005), the disabled, asylum seekers and sentient beings (Nussbaum 2006) along with future generations live ‘precarious lives’ (Butler 2005). Those perceived as different are not protected (Young 1990). The ability to show compassion underpins cosmopolitanism (Butler 2011). Her work stresses ‘the need to rethink *the human* as a site of interdependency.’ Butler stresses that humanity needs to be able to ask for assistance and we need to be able to anticipate that we will be heard and that people will respond with compassion. Unless this is possible, it leads to a life that can be unbearable. Do we wish to live in a world where we do want to help one another and in which we deny the pain of sentient beings? The ability to show compassion underpins cosmopolitanism (Butler 2011).¹⁸

If we are prepared to recognize not our resilience, but our mutual vulnerability, it provides a basis for stewardship. We are all reliant on others and need to be able to depend on our connections with others. What if we could recognize our vulnerability and what if we could foster a sense of caring for others that recognizes our humanity and our links with others?¹⁹

1.3.1 Personal and Public Transformation Towards Cosmopolitan Politics and Implications for Relationships

One of the lessons I learned in Alice Springs from a mentor who regularly travelled from work to the local government offices in the Alice Springs Town Council by wheelchair was that disability could be regarded as a different ability. She was able to highlight all the challenges that a non-wheelchair user would have been unable to spot, because they did not have her insights or experiences. These were invaluable in applying the Disability Discrimination Act of 1992 at the local government level, but more profoundly if more people were enabled to work, because they are supported to enter or re-enter the workforce all society would benefit.

¹⁸ Butler (2006) stressed in a videoed conversation with Sunaura “that in this world we need each other, in order to meet our basic needs” NominalistWay 6 videos. In these, she explores the importance of ‘giving an account of oneself.’ In a conversation with a young woman (Examined Life—Judith Butler and Sunaura Taylor 720p.avi). In conversation, Sunaura explains that disability is socially constructed through the disabling affects of the way people respond to you... “Just organising myself ordering a coffee and demanding help is a political protest... we all need help... We are all interdependent... Impairment is the medical fusion of bones and the way it affects movement.”

¹⁹ <http://unpresentable.wordpress.com/2010/05/13/toward-a-post-human-political-theory-deleuze-guattari-and-disability-studies-%E2%80%93-4/>.

The argument developed by Skete (2012)²⁰ is that the nation would be more productive and that everyone would benefit by having more people employed. If we measure *wellbeing* not *productivity*, an even stronger case could be made. It is ironic that Stiglitz/2010 paper on ‘Wellbeing—not Productivity’ is still not understood by policymakers. If costs are not measured in limited market terms and instead we consider the opportunity costs of excluding people from society, we would be able to make another and even stronger cost. Skete (2012) cites the case of Kim Jago:

For almost 19 years, she has been working for the Victorian Department of Justice. Jago suffers from a degenerative muscle disease called spinal muscular atrophy, which means just making it to the office each day is a minor triumph ... To do so she has cobbled together 19 hours of personal care assistance. Recently the Multiple Sclerosis Society told her it would have to cut the 10 hours a week it was providing to two. There is no way I can continue working without these 8 hours...

When the Productivity Commission described the disability support system as ‘underfunded, unfair, fragmented and inefficient,’ it was talking about the situation facing people such as Jago...

Justice needs to be addressed through social movements that are buttressed by international law that is supported by regional courts. The recognition of the EU (despite its many failings) with a Nobel Peace Prize is indicative of the potential of the EU. In a confederation, citizens do not have a direct say in international affairs and an example of the confederalist model is the EU. Archibugi (2010) stresses this is different from the ‘more rigid constitutional structure’ of the USA or Australia, for example.

Florini (2003) in her book *The Coming Democracy* outlines an argument for the potential of the EU (and other confederations) to scale up the Aarhus Convention to enable all citizens—who are members of the EU—to have a say. Currently, the Aarhus Convention addresses environmental concerns but it ought to also address social concerns. This could provide the architecture for a balanced approach to involvement by members of a federalist union that respects the identity of sovereign nations and their citizens—to the extent that their freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others. Protection ought to be extended to include young people, future generations, the voiceless (including sentient beings), the disabled and those who are not protected by citizenship rights and the social contract.

According to realists, the problem with cosmopolitan politics is where do governments of nation states draw the line as to how they support those who seek refuge and asylum? The norms of hospitality are unrealistic, they say.

The strong cosmopolitan argument is that the basis for categorical or containerist thinking is fallacious. But we do not live in separate containers; we live in interconnected, overlapping regions. Our fates are interlinked. The onus is upon all nations to rethink the notion of democracy and governance. First, the economy cannot continue to extract profit at the expense of the wellbeing of current and future generations.

²⁰ Skete, M. (2012) ‘Disability help a win for us all: the lack of Medicare-style insurance scheme hurts individuals and society’, *Weekend Australian*, March 10–11, p. 22.

Wellbeing—not the economic bottom line—needs to be the focus of our attention for cultural transformation, according to Stiglitz et al. (2010). But this requires reconceptualising culture. The strong cosmopolitan stresses the importance of recognizing the value of the environment on which we depend and thus recognizes that we are either part of the change or complicit in contributing to the problem of ‘consuming the planet.’ Thus, Elliot and Urry (2010) stress the implications of developing a non-carbon economy for cultural transformation. Transformation will require changing the way in which we care for others (Mukta 2010, 2005). This will imply reconceptualising how we engage with one another and our attitude towards commodifying people, animals and the environment. The neo-conservative market uses people and the planet without care of the consequences.

The strong cosmopolitan approach extends the argument by Kant on hospitality to strangers by stressing the importance of the recognition of transnational agreements and law on environmental concerns and human rights (Nussbaum 2006). The strong cosmopolitan will define human security (Kaldor 2003, 2004) in terms of meeting human rights for all and avoiding a Eurocentric approach when addressing human rights. Cosmopolitanism as a concept has developed through responding to the critics such as Babar and Derrida who emphasized the difficulties associated with universalism and the colonial and imperialist overtones.

The cosmopolitan potential detailed for participatory action research detailed in Volume 1 is discussed in terms of prefiguring a means to hold the market to account. Could this approach ensure that the use of local and regional resources that are necessary for the common good is accessible and equitable? To what extent could localized living in regions support appropriate technology and use solar or biofuels to run digital systems that monitor from below? Could these enable alternative forms of democracy and governance, based on the principles of subsidiarity (Schumacher 1973)? Could this process avert the ‘Asbergerish’ future in which people become less willing to engage face-to-face, because it is too challenging (Greenfield 2003, p. 78), and how will this affect the ability of human beings to empathize with others (including sentient beings)?

Social movements such as the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street movement provide an example of the way in which citizens within nation states and citizens in a range of contexts can claim a wider public space. But it also raises questions about what will happen in the future. Not only do stocks for the future need to be developed, but the current commodification of people, animals and the environment is simply unsustainable. The current energy choices are also unsustainable. This requires a transformation that is long overdue. The introduction of nuclear energy and the continuing use of coal as an energy choice are equally fraught. Butler²¹ links the

²¹ http://www.salon.com/2011/10/24/judith_butler_at_occupy_wall_street/. By viewing the video, the performative approach to social change through being the change through reframing the current socio-economic system:

“If hope is an impossible demand, then we demand the impossible. In brief remarks to the occupiers at Liberty Plaza, Butler offered her take on the continuing ‘demands’ debate: People have

need for food and employment; these along with energy and water are the basics of life that need to be protected through transnational movements.

The argument against dialogue across boundaries (Kymlicka 2010) is that people do not have shared languages and meanings and that their perceptions and values would differ to such an extent that they are unlikely to be able to engage in dialogue. The argument is that even if the dialogue does occur the so-called ‘territory of the mind’ will be very diverse and so creation of shared agreements would be difficult. Strong cosmopolitans argue, however, that by virtue of being human animals we share many quality-of-life needs, if we are to achieve our capacity to live full lives.

Thus, democracy needs to be deepened and widened. This is not a contradiction if it is governed by transnational constitutions that provide space for diversity and freedom, but within the limits of international law that protect future generations of life from poor policy decisions that could undermine the very fabric of life as we know it. A public sphere has already been created through the various forms of digital media that allow for carefully facilitated conversations based on an awareness of our precarious lives.²² Stanescu (2012, p. 575) sums it up as follows:

Butler develops vulnerability and precariousness as an ethic, a social ontology, and a politics. It is because we are beings who can be hurt and killed that we have sociality, that we have a capacity for being-together. Although precariousness seems to refer to an individual life, it is rather a way of thinking connections, of claiming kinship and relations. This is not about beginning with the self’s own precariousness, and then expanding that notion to others ... It has to be an understanding of the precariousness of the Other (Butler 2004a, p. 134). Precariousness is a place for thinking the ethical because it begins with the other, rather than with the self.

Proximity is not the only basis for responsibility to others (Butler 2011). The notion of contract or consent to give others rights needs to be extended. When turning on the television or passing a news stand, we may be confronted by images of desperation. Living in privileged circumstances as a result of the privileges of birth or chance does not excuse us from obligation to others. Our initial emotional response to a story or image may also require of us a responsibility to act. Conferring rights and responsibilities on the basis of the construct of citizenship within the boundaries of a nation state is insufficient for moral choices. Although the EU has received a Nobel Peace Prize for its transnational approach to democracy and governance,

asked, so what are the demands? What are the demands all of these people are making? Either they say there are no demands and that leaves your critics confused, or they say that the demands for social equality and economic justice are impossible demands. And the impossible demands, they say, are just not practical. If hope is an impossible demand, then we demand the impossible—that the right to shelter, food and employment are impossible demands, then we demand the impossible. If it is impossible to demand that those who profit from the recession redistribute their wealth and cease their greed, then yes, we demand the impossible”.

²² We need to develop an increased understanding of our interrelatedness with others and the land. We need to become more conscious that we are part of a systemic web of iterations and that human beings are not only dependent on one another, but are also connected with other sentient animals. We are all dependent on the land, air and water (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011, 2012b).

the nationalist sentiments in Portugal, Spain and Greece express concern for the future of their welfare, because the austerity measures are hard to shoulder. Those who have opted to remain outside the EU emphasize the importance of diversity and identity. But the importance of transnational governance remains, even if economic austerity needs to be reframed through more systemic forms of accounting and accountability that bears in mind the social, cultural, political, economic and environmental concerns. Social justice can however be better served through forms of governance buttressed by regional courts that are transparent, democratic and accountable to those who are the most vulnerable to human rights abuse. Cosmopolitanism can be defined as follows:

there are moral obligations owed to all human beings based solely on our humanity alone, without reference to race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, culture, religion, political affiliation, state citizenship, or other communal particularities ... cosmopolitans believe that the primary units of moral concern are individual human beings, not states or other forms of communitarian or political association ... (Brown and Held 2010, pp. 2–3).

If the concern is for all human beings then we need to question the way in which the market is reified and deified by sovereign states that support the market. Sometimes culture can serve corrupt interests. Dr. Carlo Tognato coined the term ‘Stability cultures’. In a recent public lecture (2012), entitled ‘The cultural logic of independent central banking’, he explained,

Scholars and practitioners have intuitively perceived that culture may have something to do with the link between legitimacy, public support and central bank independence, and have even coined a concept—that of stability culture—to refer to that link. Their understanding of stability cultures, however, is still too shallow and often merely tautological.

But the complicity involving the support of the status quo that is highlighted by Nathan (2012) needs to be balanced by the complicity of developed nations who have profited from other nations, for example, in Africa. So where does this leave us?

The post-national argument developed by Habermas (2001) needs to be understood as ensuring that nations do not give up all their rights and that rights and responsibilities are balanced to ensure the individual and collective needs are met. This is a necessary requirement to address the systemic challenges we face collectively on the planet. Subsidiarity rather than national sovereignty could enable local dialogue and deliberation to develop legitimate agendas that are discussed at a regional tier that is accountable to the local residents. Shared decisions are then developed and representatives then decide within regional parliaments that may have cross-cutting delegations from a range of nation states to address issues pertaining to poverty and climate change. According to Beardsworth (2010, p. 106):

The principle of subsidiarity goes some way towards reinventing supranational and national democratic polity without either compromising unduly national autonomy or falling into the trap of a universal state. At the very least it offers a principled response to the twenty-first-century condition of interdependence...

Once nation states are unable to meet their own citizen’s needs, elected leaders (mindful of the next election) develop arguments for protecting the rights of those within the boundaries of the nation state. The minimalist approach to cosmopolitanism,

based on a sense of moral arguments (without political responsibility), becomes the order of the day. Beardsworth (2011, p. 61) argues that realists would say that it is the ‘discourse of declining powers’ and that cosmopolitanism would have little support in China or India.

Nation states, argue the realists, will in general be keen to justify human rights and intervention to address specific social, economic or environmental concerns, if it is considered to be in their interest to do so. Thus, outrage is expressed, argue the realists, when an area that is resource rich is under threat. The cynical realist argues that aid follows the political economic agenda. Access to energy and mineral wealth has driven the aid agenda in Asia, South America and Africa. Food and water will be the next driving factors for international aid and market expansion.

Realists argue that aid follows the interests of aid givers, whereas the strong cosmopolitan argument is based on an understanding that humanity is dependent upon one another and the land and that the zero-sum approach of profit or survival at the expense of the other simply does not hold. It is unsustainable. Theorists across social, economic and environmental disciplines have argued that national governance needs to be mindful that ‘space ship earth’ (Buckminster Fuller)²³ requires protection from all nations. We are not adrift in separate lifeboats. This is the categorical fallacy that is supported by narrow disciplinary approaches to the big problems of the day, namely poverty and climate change. But political transformation needs to be more than a technical operations approach. Demographic transitions follow empowerment of women and a rise in living standards through gender mainstreaming and social justice. Beardsworth (2010, p. 165) poses a false dichotomy between polarizing people versus the environment:

...presently the majority of the world’s population faces a straightforward choice between exit from poverty on the one hand and CO₂ abatement on the other...

Mitigation of the causes and adaptation to the consequences of climate change is in the interests of everyone. Charlton (2011) has stressed that creativity and design could provide a way forward. As we face convergent social, economic and environmental challenges, the complex, wicked choices are posed; these are changing society, changing the environment and changing ourselves. Social engineering has stared into the abyss of totalitarianist control and free market capitalism. We face climate change challenges and market failure as starving people protest. The potential for adaptation to climate change poses suggestions that bioengineering and speciation that includes a post-human future has been raised and set aside as a choice that ought not to be made, even if it can be made (Fukuyama 2002, p. 218). Liberal democracy as it is currently framed is considered better, by Fukuyama, because it protects our ‘human essence,’ but the ‘hopes, fears and struggles’ of those who live wretched lives of exploitation are not necessarily understood by those who live

²³ Buckminster Fuller, R. 1968 *Operating Manual For Spaceship Earth* (ISBN 0-525-47433-1) or (ISBN 3-037-78126-2), (ISBN 9783037781265). http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operating_Manual_for_Spaceship_Earth#cite_note-1. Accessed 21/01/2013.

privileged lives that are protected by the social contract extended to citizens within democracies.

Could we change the architecture of democracy and governance to enable more creative designs that balance the individual and the collective needs through participation, based on the axiom that we can be free and diverse to the extent that freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others? What does this mean for constructing and reconstructing the way in which we live? The addiction to consumption will require both a transformation of values through a change of heart and through new forms of structural governance to address systemic poverty as well as mobilisation by people to drive the change within and across nation states, if imperialist war to access resources is to be avoided. Beardsworth (2010, p. 168) draws on the work of Chevalier that

...proposes a new Marshall Plan for the developing world in the context of the explosive interaction between population growth and a world of scarce resources. (2009, p. 142).

The notion of anthropocentric responsibility is raised by Hayden (2010, p. 365) who links sustainable development with climate change and social justice (Bergin and Yates 2009). As he expresses it,

...sustainable development is one that is explicitly intended to further the goal of greater justice across the planet. Yet it is also an idea constrained by internal tensions or limitations that arise from the fact that it remains firmly entrenched in the terrain of state interests and the economics of consumerism. These tensions at the heart of the concept of sustainable development weaken the perception that the natural environment ought to be protected, thereby leaving the potentially progressive elements of sustainable development largely squandered...

Addressing climate change requires not merely adaptation to the consequences of climate change, but addressing the causes, namely the unsustainable consumption of resources leading to heavy carbon footprints by China and USA, in particular. The implications for international relations requires co-operation between the major emitters and a realization of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) goals. Institutional responses need to be wide ranging and this has implications for global governance. Expanding pragmatism is a process to address the context and consequences of human decisions.²⁴

The root cause of consumption is power without responsibility—so whoever comes to power needs to be held to account through mechanisms to develop social, economic and environmental indicators that secure the wellbeing stocks for the future.

Rights to consume need to be balanced by responsibility to consume in ways that impact the life chances of others (including future generations of life). Thus, the rule of law needs to be post-national and global supported by a covenant to protect all life. This needs to be secured by overlapping federations of biospheres

²⁴ Let us start with the IPCC formula that addresses the implications of polarizing people versus the planet. IPCC formula E (emissions)=population × consumption per person × energy efficiency × energy emissions. Existential risk has implications for representation, accountability and sustainability. Consumption is very unequal and the gaps between rich and poor become wider and wider.

buttressed in law and supported by a judicial system, hence the axiom for expanding pragmatism—we can be free and diverse to the extent that our freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others or future generations of life.

The test for decisions must be based on the consequences for others and the next generation, based on ‘sweeping in’ the contextual values of stakeholders but making governance decisions that protect the wellbeing of others and future generations of life. Cosmopolitan citizens need to:

- Take into account many kinds of knowledge within context. But social and environmental justice requires monitoring from above and below—within and beyond the nation state—in post-national federations. Transformation through extending capabilities to think differently is vital—this willingness to co-operate will come about as a new form of monitory democracy becomes global.
- Address the challenge posed by Stiglitz (2010) to the Australian Productivity Commission, namely to foster an understanding that the wellbeing of humanity is dependent on the global commons. It makes the case that an Orwellian future of digital top-down controls or a breakdown of essential services in ungoverned regions is already a reality that needs to be controlled and reversed through balancing individual and collective needs.
- Explore the potential for participatory democracy and governance to (a) monitor, (b) match services to need and (c) blow the whistle on injustice. It makes the case that the following are amongst the greatest challenges facing humanity and that they potentially pose an ‘existential risk’: (a) representation of the increasingly diverse populations within nation states, (b) accountability to ensure that resources are used fairly and equitably and sustainably and (c) engagement to enhance the capability of people to understand that attitudes towards consumption have profound implications for social and environmental justice. McIntyre-Mills (2010a, b, 2011a, b) and McIntyre-Mills and De Vries (2010, 2011, 2012) discuss narratives that prefigure a means to hold the market to account—to ensure that the use of resources that are necessary for the common good are accessible and equitable. We face a systemically linked social, economic and environmental crisis that currently poses a challenge to sovereign states.

1.4 Praxis Challenges Associated with Enhancing Engagement

How to enable local communities through a cosmopolitan approach is the essential question for this chapter. It addresses the essential question, raised by Benhabib (2004), namely how to:

reconcile universalistic principles of human rights, autonomy, and freedom with our concrete identity as members of certain human communities divided by language, by ethnicity, by religion.

This is vital for developing a sense of solidarity, rather than fragmentation, but the next step is to develop compassion based on an understanding that we are people through others (Ramphela 2012) and we need to develop participatory democracy to hold those who govern us to account, not merely in the nation state, but internationally. This requires a change of heart and a realization that we need to define ourselves not in terms of what we have, but in terms of being the change, to draw on Fanon and Gandhi. It is also recognition of the ‘banality of evil’ (Arendt 1963) and the need for self-criticism.

Theory and practice needs to address the following according to Beardsworth (2010, p. 237):

- (i) exposition of the responsibilities of global leadership and the role of a responsible state in a globalized world; (ii) the re-invention (rather than the extension) of democracy for a globalized world; (iii) a detailed exposition of the world economy and of the possibility of co-ordination on global governance issues from a cosmopolitan realist perspective; (iv) an analysis of global liberal governance that holds strategies of empowerment and control together and offers legal and political remedy.

This chapter provides a strong critique of the current state–market complicity in the degradation of the quality of life of people in both developed and developing nations.

The concept of cosmopolitanism refers to the notion that human beings are citizens of the world who ought to extend hospitality to one another; the ability to see one another as part of one human family is of course not the preserve of the western thinking. The notion of Ubuntu meaning ‘we are people through other people’ is African. The notion that we are caretakers of the planet for this generation and the next is widely accepted by indigenous peoples of the world—Maori, Peruvian, African and Indian. Compassion for the plight of others is shared by many religions, for example, Christian, Buddhist and Islamic.

1.4.1 Extending the Horizon of Solidarity

The first challenge is to ensure that the imperialist or colonial tendencies are addressed by discussing ways to ensure that agendas are not set by some at the expense of others.

Strong cosmopolitan research supports the notion that people are people through being the change together with others (Ramphela 2012). How can we extend our horizon of solidarity through enabling people to develop a greater ability to think about the bigger picture? Ramphela (2012) has stressed the need to engage with people so that they show leadership. She stresses the need for citizens to hold leaders to account. This is increasingly relevant not only at a national but also at an international level, because the problems of poverty and environmental collapse cannot be addressed within the contained context of the nation state.

Members of the public need to be protected by a scaled-up version of the Aarhus Convention²⁵ that gives residents within post-national regions the right to access information and to the right to be heard by the state (1998, see McIntyre-Mills 2011).

This chapter (a) discusses the theory of participatory democracy—based on the principles of subsidiarity and Ashby’s rule of requisite variety—and (b) makes a case for new forms of accountability to support regional governance that is capable of extending the social contract beyond the nation state and thus to protect biospheres and the diversity within them. The governance decisions will need to be upheld by rule of law based on the axiom that we can be free and diverse to the extent that freedom and democracy is not undermined. McIntyre-Mills (2006a, b) and McIntyre-Mills and De Vries (2011) make the case for:

- Systemic matching of governance options in context through a range of engagement processes.
- Social change to address wellbeing is not merely about productivity for profit.
- Understanding the systemic implications of energy choices on food, energy and water.
- Transdisciplinarity and a reframed approach to wellbeing, based on engagement processes rooted in face-to-face, hands-on processes to develop healing conversations, share resources at the local level and then to enable these local, neighbourhood groups to engage with local facilitators to represent them in wider fora (Ramphele 2012; McIntyre-Mills 2012).

The challenge to ensure representation and accountability will be ongoing and will require multiple iterations of feedback in ongoing critical cycles. This seems to be a sensible response to the shared problems we face today, namely global warming and global poverty. Globally, the minority 1% own the majority of the resources and

²⁵ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/aarhus/>. According to the European Commission website,

“The Aarhus Convention establishes a number of rights of the public (individuals and their associations) with regard to the environment. The Parties to the Convention are required to make the necessary provisions so that public authorities (at national, regional or local level) will contribute to these rights to become effective. The Convention provides for:

- The right of everyone to receive environmental information that is held by public authorities (‘access to environmental information’). This can include information on the state of the environment, but also on policies or measures taken, or on the state of human health and safety where this can be affected by the state of the environment. Applicants are entitled to obtain this information within one month of the request and without having to say why they require it. In addition, public authorities are obliged, under the Convention, to actively disseminate environmental information in their possession;
- The right to participate in environmental decision-making. Arrangements are to be made by public authorities to enable the public affected and environmental non-governmental organisations to comment on, for example, proposals for projects affecting the environment, or plans and programmes relating to the environment, these comments to be taken into due account in decision-making, and information to be provided on the final decisions and the reasons for it (‘public participation in environmental decision-making’);
- The right to review procedures to challenge public decisions that have been made without respecting the two aforementioned rights or environmental law in general (‘access to justice’).”

the majority of the poor live on less than 2 \$ a day. The gaps between the rich and poor continue to widen as the crisis deepens. Thus, the changes that need to occur require joint action to persuade the immoral minority. Weak cosmopolitans suggest this can be achieved through ethics (buttressed by national laws) that support international treaties. Strong cosmopolitans stress that agency to express political rights is the responsibility of global citizens who need to understand that no one gives power; it has to be taken by those who are oppressed. Realists can dismiss the strong cosmopolitan argument by stressing that ‘borders and power are irreducible’ (Beardsworth 2011, p. 51) and that only weak and moderately powerful nations who have a welfare state that is functional are likely to support this.

1.4.2 International Conversations and Social Movements

The social movements comprising the so-called Arab Spring indicates the ability of people with nation states to apply their personal agency to issues. The so-called Wall Street movement has raised awareness internationally that business as usual is problematic, but citizens will need to work with, within and across states at multiples levels and through multiple forms of media and face-to-face at local neighbourhood levels to create a sense of ‘walking together’ through healing conversations (McIntyre-Mills 2010; McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011; Ramphela 2012). Bohman (2004) cites Mead and asks,

Could a conversation be conducted internationally? The question is a question of social organisation (Mead 1934, p. 271). Given the clearly pluralistic basis of international society, we might expect the institutional forms of a multi perspectival polity to unlink democratic authority from the exclusive territorial form of democratic citizenship and authority tied to nation states, as it begins to reflect the enriched possibilities of politically relevant perspectives. The value of such deliberation is that it permits precisely the sort of reflection necessary for the transformation of democracy within nation states into multi-perspectival polities that incorporate cosmopolitan public sphere into their political life.

This section addresses the program of research on representation, accountability and engagement to adapt to and mitigate the extent of risks (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011; McIntyre-Mills 2012). Thus, its emphasis is not merely to describe what the case is, but to discuss participatory action research that strives to design and prefigure alternative praxis as a seed for transformation. The research (detailed in Chap. 4, vol 1) tests the principle of subsidiarity and Ashby’s rule of requisite variety (1956) to establish ways to enhance representation, accountability and engagement. In response to Bostrom (2011), research programs ought to address ‘the politics of climate change’, in order to face up to ‘existential risk’.

The complexity of wicked social, economic and environmental challenges need to be informed by the contributions of transdisciplinary research that takes into account the physicists and natural sciences as well as the emotions of those who are to be affected by the political ramifications of decisions. This requires the capacity for all world citizens to engage in democratic governance through thinking about the consequence of their local contextual decisions for their neighbours and the

next generation of life. Strong cosmopolitanism addresses the challenge posed by Stiglitz (2010), namely to foster an understanding that the wellbeing of humanity is dependent on the global commons. Instead of merely making ethical exhortations or constructing legal frames of reference, the strong cosmopolitan engages in praxis. This means that participatory action research is perhaps one of the greatest contributions made by cosmopolitan researchers. They explore the potential for participatory democracy and governance to (a) monitor, (b) match services to need and (c) mitigate risk and adapt to climate change. The design builds on research with Aboriginal service users and providers whose philosophy on wellbeing raised areas of concern which this research strives to address.

This research attempts to enable people to think through the ‘if-then’ scenarios, not merely to ‘unfreeze’ (to cite Lewin’s concept), but to work towards sustainable praxis, based on an understanding of our inter relatedness. This requires ongoing changes to learning (Schein 1996), ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1977) or ways of ‘being in the world’ (Haraway 1991, 1992, 2010). The exercise of ‘thinking about our thinking’ is an attempt to build new neural pathways in the mind—to rehearse a different way of ‘being in the world,’ based on thinking about the consequences for themselves, others and the environment. The research aims to establish if it is possible for cultural transformation to enable a shift from denial to ambivalence to sustainable cosmopolitanism. It strives to enable a greater awareness of consciousness of our rights and responsibilities as global citizens.²⁶ It is practical in that it attempts to acknowledge that localized, slow lives that are sustainable could lapse into the Orwellian nightmare of control from above—without surveillance from below to hold the elites to account. It is for this reason that the digital future needs to be shaped not only by the state military complex but also by those who wish to act as whistle-blowers.

Giddens (2009) points out that social movements will not be sufficient to bring about change. Nation states together with international organizations will need to implement international laws to protect the environment:

Decentralisation contributes to democratic deepening if and when it expands the scope and depth of citizen participation in public decision making. Expanding the depth means incorporating previously marginalised or disadvantaged groups into public politics. Expanding the scope means bringing in a wider range of social and economic issues into the authoritative domain of politics (shifting the boundary from the market to the demos. Democratic decentralisation in other words means redistributing power (the authority to make binding decisions about the allocation of public resources) both vertically (incorporating citizens) and horizontally (expanding the domain of collective decision making). Empowered local governments deepen democracy on both counts because they foster a better alignment of decision making centres with local preferences and local sources of knowledge and information, and because it creates loci of participation that reduce the costs and unevenness of collective action (Heller 2001, p. 140).

²⁶ This research emphasizes the creation of multiple paths to form webs to wellbeing through critical, systemic engagement to ensure that local people get to know about local resources (that are listed in directories created by both service users and providers) and that their identity is protected. They are able to see the typical scenarios of what people have, need, are prepared to add or discard from their lives and what they think are turning points for the better and worse.

Systemic ethics need to underpin new forms of democracy and governance to mitigate and adapt to climate change through creativity rather than economic growth. ‘The poor will inherit the earth’ is a biblical message which looks increasingly likely—albeit the inheritance will be fairly bleak on this side of the grave, unless creative options are explored to secure quality of life in surroundings that ensure food security and a life worth living. According to Morton (2011),²⁷ in an article entitled “Four degrees of Separation”:

Professor McMichael says it was likely four degrees warming would be just as disruptive to agriculture, reducing the planet’s ability to feed a rapidly growing population. Similarly, water supplies would evaporate in heavily populated areas as rainfall patterns changed and rivers dried up. ‘We will face much more than frequent heat waves and weather disasters,’ he says. ‘There will be food shortages, malnutrition, increases in many infectious diseases, widespread mental depression, anxiety and rural misery, and tensions and conflicts over resource shortages, population displacement and refugee flows... The ANU Climate Change Institute’s executive director, Will Steffen, and a Monash Sustainability Institute director, Dave Griggs, argue there are likely to be compounding crises. This could bring about changes in demographics, resource availability, biodiversity loss and global politics interact.

In vast informal sector communities, such as those in Khayalitsha, Cape Town South, could become more widespread. The dignity of poverty is one that has been learned since colonization by the Dutch and British and then the rise of the nationalist party in 1948 that led to protecting the poor white Afrikaner at the expense of the majority who lived in ghettos or so-called homelands that served as labour camps under apartheid. The change to a stable SA came about not only through sanctions and boycotts of the economy but also through the leadership of Madiba (Nelson Mandela) that stressed shepherdship—leading from behind and through respectful engagement with others—whilst underlining that violence could be a last resort that needs to be avoided through recognizing the rights of all. The gap between rich and poor in SA remains a challenge. The Cape Flats have one of the highest levels of murder in the world and one of the highest levels of unemployment—growth without distribution has led to increased criticism of the state. On the streets recycling, creativity and entrepreneurship has become a way of life. In contrast, the middle class recyclers in the leafy suburbs give tokenistic consideration of green issues. But the necessity for change needs to be underpinned by legislation. For example, in a suburb in South Australia with a high standard of living, residents such as an editor of Anti-apartheid books—now a green activist in the suburb—stress the need to make a difference each day to ‘be the change.’ Because of her mobility, she was able to move when she faced political threats.

The definition of property is a nonindigenous concept, based on a containerist philosophy. It has been challenged by the land rights legislation led by Mabo. The legal construct can be redefined and reconnecting with the land can be relearned.

²⁷ <http://www.theage.com.au/environment/climate-change/four-degrees-of-separation-20110708-1h6yi.html#ixzz1S2YGAKwX>.

It is debatable to what extent religious messages about sharing and redistributing resources have greater resonance in Western industrial nations such as USA, where young people increasingly argue that they do not follow any religion.²⁸

Religion, spirituality and a sense of meaning derived from a philosophy of life plays a role in enabling people to recover from disasters such as the tsunami in Ache in 2003 and the nuclear disaster in Japan in 2011. This is why Dawkins (2006) can be challenged, when he suggests that religion provides no evolutionary advantage.

In fact, religion helps to make sense or meaning out of the most challenging experiences. Those who survive the greatest challenges do so as a result of their ability to make sense or meaning out of the worst life experiences. Frankel (1955) reflected on his experiences in a concentration camp and said that the human spirit and a sense of god made the difference in the ability to survive.

The governance gaze from above and monitory democracy ‘from below’ needs to achieve a balance and some develop humility to avoid the dangers of hubris. Lessons from nature, science, religion and art/design help restore a respect for the need to nurture biodiversity and a realization of our place within it. It also enables human beings to appreciate the extent to which we are designers of our future and the extent to which we are limited by our unfolding circumstances. The global commons needs to be supported by laws to protect the collective good.

Finding ways to reconnect to the land is vital to protect wellbeing and to secure food, water and energy supplies.²⁹ We have enough to pay for ‘the needs of all, but not the greed of all,’ to draw on Shiva who cites Gandhi.³⁰ Sanctions need to be applied to international organizations that try to extract profit from labour, the land and now through patenting life. The core challenge is not only that these resources will need to meet the needs of rising populations. In developed nations, there is a negative population growth rate. It is a fact that higher levels of education and better quality of life leads to lower numbers of children. The demographic transition can be achieved through building capability (Nussbaum and Sen 1993; Crocker

²⁸ The voting Republicans (aged 18 and above) in the USA have given support for a Mormon to lead the opposition to punish an incumbent government. According to Gerson (2012), although Putnam and Campbell (2010) argue that 25% of 18–29-year-olds described their religious preference as none in 2006, by 2011 it had risen to 33% and in 5 years. But a closer look at the data presented by Putnam and Campbell (2010, 99–100) shows that the religiosity of young people has fluctuated greatly. In 1957, 69% of young people considered religion to be relevant, in 1962, only 45%. In 1965 33%, in 1967, 23%, in 1968, 18%, in 1970 30–40% thought it irrelevant and in 1986 10% thought religion was relevant. This suggests that religiosity waxes and wanes as social history unfolds spanning the Vietnam War and the oil crisis to the realization of convergent crises. People turn to or away from religion at times of crisis. They also redefine what they mean by religion. Spirituality—based on a love of the land and an ecumenical respect for diversity—may provide a way forward, but the opportunity may also be lost—if voters follow conservative leaders who promise that the current economy can be rescued. The decline in religiosity is occurring amongst the younger groups of voters, but nevertheless voters over 18 years of age in America are searching for meaning through a resurgence in religious belief, as is indicated by the opposition Republican leader.

²⁹ <http://www.rolefoundation.org/index.php/environmental-assistance-projects/>.

³⁰ <http://www.navdanya.org/news/229-awesome>.

et al. 1995; Sen 2000). A negative birth rate is achieved in many developed nations. Gender mainstreaming needs to enable men and women to work together in agricultural and other development initiatives. Enabling quality of life begins at the household level and is then scaled up to enhance equality at the local, national and post-national level (Kabeer in March et al. 1999; McIntyre-Mills and de Vries 2011). The demographic transition will occur—provided enhancing quality of life is focused on meeting needs—as opposed to encouraging the greed and lavish lifestyles that are enjoyed by the minorities. The value of agricultural production needs to be promoted, rather than increasing the intensive production of farm animals. Not only is the erosion of their quality of life unconscionable, it leads to epidemics and possibly pandemics of diseases.

1.4.3 *Transdisciplinary Cosmopolitan Research*

In order to address the big issues of the day, namely poverty and climate change, the ability to work across disciplines and with diverse colleagues with a range of cultural backgrounds is vital.

Transdisciplinary research diverges from the limited calculations of economics and is instead rooted in notions of what wellbeing actually means for cultural change. It is, for example, informed by sociocultural cybernetics and physics, drawing on West Churchman (1971), De Beer (1992), Schumacher (1973), Shiva (2002, 2011),³¹ Christakis and Bausch (2006) and Bausch and Flanagan (2011). Charlton criticizes the Southern Cross Climate Coalition for arguing against coal, because he does not see any way to meet both the social and environmental justice concerns simultaneously. Emeritus Professor Alexander Christakis of Global Agora together with Flanagan, Bausch and his team have stressed the importance of democratic engagement to enhance an understanding of climate change. Recently, Prof. Wilkinson, together with Pickett (2009), linked social inclusion in more equal societies with better quality of life in their book entitled *The Spirit Level*. Nussbaum and Glover (1995), Sen (2000) and Flannery (2010) stress that a better quality of life is linked with a demographic transition to smaller population growth rates. Furthermore, the current winner of the Sydney Peace Prize, Dr. Vandana Shiva,

³¹ “The International Commission on the Future of Food and Agriculture was created in 2003 in Tuscany, Italy, as a result of an international gathering of leaders in the food and agriculture movement brought together by Claudio Martini, President of the Regional Government of Tuscany for the annual conference on globalization issues ... Chaired by noted activist, Dr. Vandana Shiva, the Commission is composed of a group of leading activists, academics, scientists, politicians and farmers from North and South working toward shaping more socially and ecologically sustainable food and agriculture systems. Its mission is the promotion and protection of biodiversity, local food production and consumption, food security and food safety, and the rights of small farmers ... It has published four far-reaching Manifestos on issues of critical importance to the future of the planet: the future of food, the future of seeds, climate change and the future of food security, and the need for new knowledge systems for a healthy planet”. <http://www.future-food.org/>. Accessed 10 April 2012.

a physicist, links wellbeing with the protection of our food supplies; whilst Joy Murray, a senior academic physicist at the University of Sydney, links the size of our carbon footprint with the wellbeing of our whole region. Olive Veverbrants, an Arrerente Australian, stressed ‘the earth is our mother’ and we depend on it for our survival. Physicists such as Shiva, Murray and Christakis see the world in terms of its interconnections. The nonlinear approach to working systemically at multiple levels could help to mitigate climate change, avert catastrophic change and adapt. Changing ourselves to respond to the environment is part of the process of adaptation. The time for working in isolation is long since over. Shiva (1988, 2011) argues that if we wish to engage with the might of World Trade Organization (WTO) and multinationals who patent seeds, then a way forward can be as profound and simple as saving seeds, growing food in as many places as possible in urban areas, using solar panels, saving water, collecting rain water and using legal force to prevent the criminalization of farmers and those who oppose the patenting of life.³²

The global financial crisis (GFC) and the environmental melt down seem to be seen as two problems—not one. Human beings cannot achieve new growth through increased extraction of profit. Instead, living elegantly and well through redistribution and simpler lifestyles supported by green economies, reciprocal sharing of resources and skills in green communities, supported by energy efficient systems.³³ According to Gamble (2000), the basis for sound economic governance is stability through full employment and a stable currency that holds its value. This needs to be supported by development that invests in human and physical capital. But Gamble neglects to factor in what Stiglitz has called ‘stocks for future generations’, or diminishing returns and the opportunity costs of destroying the means of our common survival. Most importantly, he does not factor in the dimension of care and the time to build respectful relationships with one another and the environment.

Lack of time is part of the problem supporting the culture of disposability and waste. Gamble stresses that nation states can no longer control markets, because they are subject to large corporations. But in fact, they are also subject to a rampant banking system and inhumane organizations. The concern is that those who see themselves as ‘lucky enough to have jobs’ barely have the time or energy for leisure

³² Multinational companies and the WTO have made it possible to patent the conditions of life, thereby causing almost a quarter of a million suicides by Indian farmers who cannot afford to purchase the seeds and the pesticides that are needed (despite the claims by the manufacturers). This is not so very far removed from the Australian context as the number of suicides amongst farmers has also increased as detailed elsewhere (McIntyre-Mills 2012 forthcoming).

Furthermore, the attempt to criminalize farmers who store old varieties of seed could lead to very vulnerable monocultures of foods. The idea that the very basis for life-seeds and genes can be patented is part of the process of commodifying people, animals and the fabric of life.

³³ Green buildings roofed and walled with earth and shallow-rooted plants breathe and produce photosynthesis and food. They are also cool and require less air conditioning. Alternative ways of building include, for example, constructing walls of wire mesh, with spaces filled by means of rammed earth or recycled materials, or filled with soil and planted with shallow-rooted plants. The notion of community reciprocity in, for example, Khayalitsha, Cape Flats, South Africa, enables new forms of economy based on trust. The beginnings of a noncapitalist economy is being developed in Middleville. It already exists in South Africa as a way of surviving unemployment.

activities, let alone volunteering or social action for the poor and voiceless. But those who are unemployed have led to masses of protests by those who have time and who have nothing to lose.

Developing connections with others could provide a way forward. Decisions need to be informed by connecting many kinds of knowledge and an appreciation that our wellbeing depends on the wellbeing of the planet. Our home or sense of place ought thus to be both local and global.

According to Keane (2009a, b), who has developed a detailed study to support the need for monitory democracy, more open forms of direct democracy are needed—the hung parliament in UK or Australia has not delivered the kind of policy responses needed to address convergent challenges. Keane makes the case that neither the market (which corruptly lent funds to those who could not repay—and then bundled the debts and sold them on) nor the state with which it colludes can be trusted blindly. But we cannot abandon the structures for buttressing law and order—so where to from here?

1.4.4 Creativity to Address Commodification

Politics ‘trumps environment if economic interests are not served,’ according to Charlton (2011). But if the interests of the 99% are to be served, we need to address ways to enhance more monitory democracy and governance. The means to achieve this process is more than application of social media, but they can contribute towards this goal.

Our identity needs to acknowledge that we are the land. Recognition of this could transform our culture and our identity as global stewards. This is a profound concept that has been supported until recently by most of the world’s First Nations, who have not entered the debate of planet versus profit. A nurturing, rather than competitive global identity is needed based on collaboration, rather than conquering and extracting profit. The paper makes the case for wide-ranging systemic changes through smaller interventions at every opportunity to prevent the commodification of life. This is summed up by the Sydney Peace Prize winner Vandana Shiva³⁴ as ‘the challenge for this century.’ Policy transformation to reframe economics rests on:

- The governance of banking at the national and international level—Greenspan has admitted that the market rewarded the banking cheats and more controls are needed.
- The governance of stocks for future generations of life through reducing consumption of some resources and the development of others. This has implications for codes of conduct (infrastructure, energy, food, water, air pollution, etc.).

³⁴ www.youtube.com/watch?v=UOfM7QD7-kk, <http://www.navdanya.org/news/229-awesome>, <http://www.vandanashiva.org/>.

Centralist interventions have associated risks as the increased emphasis on top-down solutions could result in more socialist-style parties gaining traction. This could lead to a continuation of top-down decision-making. The swing could be from too much emphasis on the market to too much state control. Party apparatchiks could swing quickly from capitalist to socialist. Similarly, anarchist interventions have associated risks, because the destruction of state control could lead to such wide-ranging chaos that the ability to balance public interests and the controls of the powerful (who have stored up assets or who can muster support as local warlords) would be very problematic for democracy and the environment.

Satellite technology from above can (and does) indeed map the entire planet. Whereas mapping from above is becoming commonplace as a form of control, mapping ‘from below’ by those without power is less common. The ability to combine designs via social networking using software (which is freeware)³⁵ is the rationale for this research to adapt to and mitigate where possible the effects of climate change (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011, 2012). In order to balance individual and collective needs, this is vital. It is a form of whistle-blowing that is much needed and could be undertaken under the auspices of conventions, such as a scaled-up version of the Aarhus Convention, to adapt and extend some of the arguments developed by Florini (2003) in *The Coming Democracy*.

Design capability is vital for resilient societies that need to be informed by diverse ideas. Voting is sometimes inadequate at the level of the nation state to give a sense of the fine-grained diversity at the local level, which is why discursive dialogue at the local level as well (as direct voting) can be valuable approaches—in combination—to enhance governance and democracy. But the nation state is too small to protect the global commons. Human systems have to make decisions. As West Churchman reminds us, decisions are based on what we include or exclude, whether to say ‘yes or no.’ But openness to change needs to be based on constant reviewing, rather than merely unfreezing and refreezing as Lewin suggested. Also the risk is that too much use of computers can lead to Asperger-like behaviour (Greenfield 2008). This is why many forms of engagement remain vital for democracy. But for those who are already using computers and in the thrall of digital worlds, then the use of scenarios that help them to realize the dangers of living in ‘a simulacrum’³⁶ (Baudrillard 1994) could be broken.

Benhabib (2007, p. 19) has addressed the vexed problem of the lack of hospitality to refugees. She argues that nation states should have porous borders and should respect the rights of others to seek refuge. She writes of porous borders. But what are the implications for post-national regional democracy and governance? Why are porous borders important as a response to natural disasters and the result

³⁵ See software detailed in Transformation from Wall Street to Wellbeing. In the user guide developed by Denise de Vries the software is explained: <http://prezi.com/mmfaghm40kdf/pathway-to-wellbeing/> <https://wellbeing.csem.flinders.edu.au/>

³⁶ This is more than a cyber-world; it is a belief that advertised and promoted worlds are normal and desirable. These artificial images, promoted as much by the so-called news media as by advertisers and spin politicians, have become confused with reality.

of conflict? Benhabib (op cit.): pleads for vision of ‘republican federalism’ and ‘democratic iterations,’ which would enhance popular sovereignty by establishing interconnections across the local, the national and the global. *Global Citizenship And Social Movements* (McIntyre-Mills 2000) sums up the notion “The closest we can get to truth is through dialogue.” *Democracy, Identity and Sustainability* (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011) discusses porous boundaries and establishing greater understanding and shared agendas as follows: the difference between social and natural systems is that the opening or closure of a decision is based not only on considering many variables but also on perceptions, values and emotions. How can decisions be better informed? Decisions make cuts as Churchman (1971, 1979) has explained poetically and these needed to be considered carefully so that they support social and environmental justice. Critical systemic thinking and practice is a guide for making decisions based on unfolding ideas through listening to in-depth narratives. This listening process can be the hardest to achieve and perhaps the most important part of communication and design. It can be a healing process and the part that is most important for re-establishing wellbeing. Engaging with difficult problems can enhance our wellbeing,³⁷ if people are engaged and crowds are sourced for their wisdom. (see Christakis and Bausch 2006; Bausch and Flanagan 2010; McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011; Bausch and Flanagan 2011.) The challenge is to enable voices to be heard and to enable lived experience to be shared and respected to the extent that the diverse and free flow of ideas does not undermine the rights of others or the next generation of life.

Representation requires hearing all voices respectfully but drawing the line to prevent the undermining of rights for the next generation of life. This is not happening. Accountability needs to be enhanced through education, but also through ideals and the law as stressed by Held and others. This can be achieved through narratives and listening.

Participatory design is vital for creativity and for conscious evolution. The conditions require diversity as well as a process to enable freedom to the extent that freedom does not undermine the diversity of others. Consciousness is enhanced through dialogue—conducted in ways that enhance trust and respect—without this there can be no free flow of ideas and no development of shared meaning. Consciousness means ‘knowing it all through holding it all together’ (Banathy 2000) and through weaving together strands of ideas (McIntyre-Mills 2008). Narrative enables both-and thinking and exploration of ‘if then’ scenarios. They portray present and past contexts and emotion. By telling and listening to stories, we are capable of unfolding values and emotions whilst ‘sweeping in’ the social, cultural, political and environmental context. Accountability is based on evidence that represents those who are to be affected by decisions. Boundaries are maintained by means of questioning—‘yes’/‘no’, but are informed by narratives that provide context and understanding, before making decisions or cuts. Dialogue within and beyond the nation state helps to explore one argument, an opposing argument and to try to

³⁷ Csikszentmihalyi (1990) argues in *Flow: The Psychology Of Optimal Experience* that if people are able to engage in ways that use all their potential they can either become anxious or they can achieve a state of flow.

achieve a synthesis or weaving together of ideas. This is vital for conscious evolution (Banathy 2000). Ethical decisions are more likely to be achieved. Evolution is based on conflict (yes/no, right/wrong) and also connection or collaboration. Conflict and consensus enable evolution, not merely survival of the fittest (De Waal 2009).

The moment for collaboration and consensus is overdue in our evolutionary consciousness. Perhaps the process could enable the plasticity of the human brain to take into account the policy contradictions and to find a way to move towards diversity and freedom, to the extent that diversity and freedom do not undermine the rights of all is vital. The development of tools can be used to annihilate one another or to foster our evolution through collaboration. The development of tools can be used to annihilate one another or to foster our evolution through collaboration. The program of research adapts and extends West Churchman's *Design of Inquiring Systems* (1972) to support representation, accountability and sustainability. It helps us to get beyond either/or systematic or linear planning by providing a map of knowledge.

As detailed elsewhere (McIntyre-Mills 2006), the domains of knowing span:

- Logic to find patterns.
- Empiricism to find qualitative and quantitative data.
- Dialectic to explore through dialogue one idea, an opposing idea and then to attempt a synthesis.
- Ideals supported in law and ethics and vows.
- Expanded pragmatism supported by context and narrative.

Systemic transformation is required rather than mere technological intervention to address existential risks which are largely ignored. The current approach to productivity and consumption places an unmeasured burden on the voiceless and the environment. Current forms of capitalism and socialism have exploited the environment. The monitory democracy approach suggested in this paper is to enable the people to have a say; rather than being the objects of design they are setting the agenda. The axiom that guides decisions is that freedom and diversity (FD) needs to be encouraged to the extent that FD does not undermine the fabric of life.³⁸ By finding a way to acknowledge what people perceive as valuable, perhaps we can actively reframe policy? The printing press transformed society (Florini 2003), but as McLuhan and Powers (1989) stressed it enhanced access to ideas for some, whilst others were left behind, because they could not read, or because they were manipulated by powerful controllers of the message and the media. Technology per se can

³⁸ The axiomatic ideal for systemic praxis is that we have the right to be free and diverse to the extent that our freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others. As caretakers, we need to be guided by this axiom when we test out decisions, in terms of the consequences for others and the next generation of life. Social democratic forms of governance need to find ways to balance individual and collective needs in increasingly diverse nation states. So if social democracy is flawed, what is the way forward? Our research strives to address this challenge of reframing governance and economics. This is more than mere technological transformation; it is about transforming our identity as human beings through engaging in exploration about how to bring about change.

be used in positive and negative ways. The design and application can enable either monitoring from above or from below. Ideally, top-down decision-making needs to be checked from the bottom up—by local people with local experience. This approach could potentially enable whistle-blowers to have a say. The approach could be buttressed through federations supported by learning from the potential and pitfalls of the Lisbon Treaty (Horvath and Odor 2010) which requires that social, economic and environmental legal considerations be met. The structural and process mechanisms of the EU are not able to manage the distribution of power or funding (Rhodes 1997). Clearly, if the EU is to survive, it needs to be supported by a means to balance individual and national interests with the collective good of the union. More and more members of the union are disenchanting for a number of reasons.

How do we engage people so that they are willing to act as stewards? We are the land and integral to this humility is our relationship to one another. More and more members of the union are disenchanting for a number of reasons.

How do we engage people so that they are willing to act as stewards? We are the land and integral to this humility is an appreciation of our relationship to one another.

Three options exist for transformation: centralist interventions, anarchist and negotiated discursive dialogues with a focus on expanded pragmatism. Reducing waste, reusing resources, saving resilient seeds and recycling wherever possible need to become the litmus test for households and local development, in order to redistribute resources to those in need and as a means to limit the misuse of scarce resources. Accounting and accountability at the local level need to be fostered by means of monitory democracy and governance. Our research applies this philosophy at the local level and advocates for its extension to post-national regional biospheres.

The role of the local agora at the community level could provide a means to explore ways to achieve wellbeing. But social movements will need to translate the ideas about sustainable living into practical democracy and governance interventions that are supported by the state.³⁹ This research strives to develop a means to enable scaling up participatory democracy and governance to enable monitory resources within and across regions in the interests of social and environmental justice. Balancing individual and collective rights and responsibilities requires:

- Transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

³⁹ The notion espoused by policy thinkers representation needs to be carefully controlled (to support democracy) is fallacious. If people are required to participate and to engage in ‘if then scenarios,’ they are likely to be able to understand one another’s viewpoints better and more likely to make connections. Provided that the axiom is maintained that we can be free and diverse—to the extent that our freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others. Perhaps people will realize that their rights need to be curtailed so as not to limit the freedoms of others. This is the point raised by researchers such as Murray et al. (2007) who suggest the need for alternative ways of making decisions guided by the Tuvalu Test to address the use of resources equitably within the region. This could make a difference to the way in which we live, work and engage in leisure. New forms of participatory democracy and governance through on line engagement could be used as a means to voice concerns.

- Many forms of engagement to build reflexive and critical capacity spanning (a) narratives (to explore complexity and to enable a creative flow of ideas) and (b) dialogue to cocreate an understanding of areas of convergence and divergence.
- Capability to (a) establish where to draw boundaries to establish the limits of personal rights and (b) to ensure responsibility to others, including the next generation of life. This ability to understand and recognize the spaces of overlap and divergence are vital for developing new post-national forms of democracy in a post-containerist world (that respects social and environmental justice within biospheres).

1.5 A Way Forward: Towards Redefining Our Identity and Relationships With One Another and the Land

Post-nationalism needs to be buttressed by human rights, rights to protect biospheres and the law of the sea. Nation states need to do more than merely working within boundaries to address the needs of the powerful. As discussed elsewhere, it needs to address representation, accountability and sustainability.

1.5.1 Communication, Consciousness and Signs

Communication develops as a result of responsiveness, reciprocity and the trust that flows from these interactions that can transform data into information and knowledge. Communication has evolved through developing signs in context with responses that are consistent. In contexts where signals are used often between human beings or humans and animals, the signalling can develop into shared symbols with particular meaning. The communication between sentient beings is only part of the ecosystem. The signs shared by the land with human beings and animals also needs to be given more attention. The vibrations are felt long before a tsunami hits the land. Following the migration of animals to higher ground is one of the ways to develop resilience (Shanor and Kanwal 2009, pp. 120–121; Sharpe 2005; De Waal 2009). More importantly, reading the landscape signals in order to prevent further deterioration is vital. The signal of melting ice, rising sea levels and temperatures that are unseasonal need to be read.

Just as we develop rapport with one another or with sentient animals with which we develop a caring relationship, we need to read the signs from the land. Signs merely signal a basic message—whereas symbols develop through shared meaning and a sense of reciprocal relationship.

If we ignore the signals from the land—in the same way as we can choose to ignore the signals from animals—then we will be unable to communicate or commune with nature. Often, communing is regarded as a spiritual act. Today, we have created a simulacrum—an artificial world in the media that we are beginning to

believe as real (Baudrillard 1994) and which guide the toxic consumption of resources. Human beings are in the thrall of digital media. A case could be made for using computing as a means to escape the matrix or simulacrum of false consciousness and toxic desires. This has implications for identity, democracy, governance and ethics. Most traditional religions bind together the people and the land and establish a sense of hierarchy in which the land is prior. Communication is both verbal and nonverbal. The pandemics of disease associated with swine flu, bird flu and mad cows disease are another signal. There are so many human beings that food security cannot be maintained through intensive farming that ignores the quality of life of sentient farm animals and undermines our own health. We are ignoring our destructive role within the Gaian system (Lovelock 2006, 2009).

Participation for monitory democracy is not just about ensuring that resources are used fairly and equitably. It is to enable people to think more deeply about the consequences of their choices and to enhance their consciousness.

1.6 From Stocks to Flows: New Accountability Processes for Transnational Governance

The vexed question of how to bridge individual interests and the collective good through praxis is central to finding a way forward. The basic premise is that justice requires recognition that we can be free and diverse to the extent that freedom and diversity do not undermine the rights of others within this generation and the next. We need to accept that the ideal of treating others as ends not means can be addressed through:

- Thinking about the consequences of political choices in expanded temporal and geographical terms, but also in terms of
- Rethinking the relationships of human beings to the environment and other species of life.

The chapter strives to grasp the nettle, namely that climate change requires not merely adaptation to the consequences of climate change, but also addressing the root causes, namely the unsustainable consumption of resources by the privileged at the expense of the poor and future generations. This requires addressing the challenge posed by the Earth Charter:

Everyone shares responsibility for the present and future wellbeing of the human family and the larger living world (cited by Hayden 2010, p. 368).

The Brundtland Report (1987) on our Common Future stressed our interconnectedness and the rights of future generations. Clarke (2000) stressed that the planet is a system, but all the policy documents and conferences to date have been limited by the containerist philosophy echoed by the rights of sovereign states (UN 1992, COP, 2010 in Cancun) to make decisions on the use of resources—most particularly in connection with the carbon-based economy. If we are to balance the interests of the

planet as well as ensure the rights of less developed nations to redress poverty, then we must find a way not only to innovate but also to limit the misuse of resources and to enable the fair distribution of rights and responsibilities to ensure food, energy and water supplies that underpin quality of life and wellbeing. The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights will remain rhetoric unless new forms of governance that respect diversity and freedom to the extent that the diversity and freedom of the next generation of life is not undermined. Anthropocentrism and humanism need to move towards respect for biodiversity (Nagoya Summit in Japan in 2010).

To sum up, strong cosmopolitans believe in praxis to address the most vulnerable who are unprotected by the social contract. The points about rights not merely hospitality is core to the argument for strong ethical cosmopolitanism that needs to be buttressed in law and through responsible government.

1.6.1 The Global Commons and the Collective Good Requires Strong Cosmopolitanism to Address Food, Energy and Water for Human Security

Many researchers suggest that we make a difference to climate change through our choices and our impact on the carbon footprint.⁴⁰

Physicists such as Shiva, Murray and Christakis see the world in terms of its interconnections. The nonlinear approach to working systemically at multiple levels could help to mitigate climate change, avert catastrophic change and adapt. Changing ourselves to respond to the environment is part of the process of adaptation.

⁴⁰ The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Theorem is as follows:

E (emissions) = population \times consumption per person \times energy efficiency \times energy emissions (Charlton, 2011). The options are as follows: business as usual and small adjustments for the long haul to achieve living in ways that do not risk our way of life (see McIntyre-Mills and De Vries, 2011, for a detailed argument and the details of the software). The approach developed in this paper diverges from the limited calculations of economics and is instead rooted in notions of what wellbeing actually means for cultural change. The approach is also informed by sociocultural cybernetics and physics, drawing on West Churchman (1971), De Beer (1992), Shiva (2011), Christakis and Bausch (2006) and Bausch and Flanagan (2011). Charlton criticises the Southern Cross Climate Coalition for arguing against coal, because he does not see any way to meet both the social and environmental justice concerns simultaneously. Emeritus Professor Alexander Christakis of Global Agoras together with Flanagan, Bausch and his team have stressed the importance of democratic engagement to enhance an understanding of climate change. Recently, Prof. Wilkinson, together with Pickett (2009), linked social inclusion in more equal societies with better quality of life in their book entitled *The Spirit Level*. Nussbaum and Glover (1995), Sen (2000) and Flannery (2010) stress that a better quality of life is linked with a demographic transition to smaller population growth rates. Furthermore, the current winner of the Sydney Peace Prize, Dr. Vandana Shiva, a physicist, links wellbeing with the protection of our food supplies; whilst Joy Murray, a senior academic physicist at the University of Sydney, links the size of our carbon footprint with the wellbeing of our whole region. Olive Veverbrants, an Arrerente Australian, stressed 'the earth is our mother' and we depend on it for our survival.

The time for working in isolation is long since over. Shiva argues that if we wish to engage with the might of WTO and multinationals who patent seeds, then a way forward can be as profound and simple as saving seeds, growing food in as many places as possible in urban areas, using solar panels, saving water, collecting rain water and using legal force to prevent the criminalization of farmers and those who oppose the patenting of life. According to Shiva, multinational companies and the WTO have made it possible to patent the conditions of life, thereby causing almost a quarter of a million suicides by Indian farmers who cannot afford to purchase the seeds and the pesticides that are needed (despite the claims by the manufacturers). This is not so very far removed from the Australian context as the number of suicides amongst farmers has also increased as detailed elsewhere (McIntyre-Mills 2012, forthcoming).

Furthermore, the attempt to criminalize farmers who store old varieties of seed could lead to very vulnerable monocultures of foods. The idea that the very basis for life-seeds and genes can be patented is part of the process of commodifying people, animals and the fabric of life.

The GFC and the environmental melt down seem to be seen as two problems—not one. Human beings cannot achieve new growth through increased extraction of profit, instead living elegantly and well through redistribution and simpler lifestyles supported by green economies, reciprocal sharing of resources and skills in green communities, supported by energy-efficient systems.⁴¹

Held proposed that the core challenges of the day are to address the vast differences in the standard of living between the rich and the poor through reforming world trade and through using the market to address global warming by means of a global covenant that prevents unilateral interventions.

In response to his critics, Held claims that the resources exist for a reformed United Nations that could make a difference to post-national governance. The UN according to Scruton (2005, pp. 47–48) is corrupt, the bureaucrats are overpaid and he argues that national sovereignty is the only way to make a difference through controlling corruption.

But the challenges facing nation states go beyond what nation states can achieve, because the challenges are not compartmentalized; they are systemic. This is why a ‘new sword’ is needed according to Barber (2005, p. 97) based on social networks, not just on a new world order. According to Occupy Wall Street, the barriers to transformation are created by the 0.01 %.

But the challenges facing nation states go beyond what nation states can achieve, because the challenges are not compartmentalized; they are systemic. This is why a

⁴¹ Green buildings roofed and walled with earth and shallow-rooted plants breathe and produce photosynthesis and food. They are also cool and require less air conditioning. Alternative ways of building include, for example, constructing walls of wire mesh, with spaces filled by means of rammed earth or recycled materials, or filled with soil and planted with shallow-rooted plants. The notion of community reciprocity in, for example, Khayalitsha, Cape Flats, South Africa, enables new forms of economy based on trust. The beginnings of a noncapitalist economy is being developed in Middleville. It already exists in South Africa as a way of surviving unemployment.

‘new sword’ is needed according to Barber (2005, p. 97) based on social networks, not just on a new world order.

The right of the minority elites to exploit others does need to be curtailed. Bond argues that more social movements are needed ‘from below’, as a result of his experience with trade union movements in SA. He stresses that the TRIPS laws were only addressed in SA through marches and not by the state.

People will need to change the world from below, but the question remains how to balance individual and collective rights. The debate that began earlier in 2004 reveals how many of the points of criticism are correct. Thompson (2005) stressed that the US economy is fragile and that assuming that the Washington Consensus and security agenda should be the starting point for discussion is problematic! In some ways, it is hubris. China and India have economies that are growing faster than the USA and they too are denying the cost of externalities and the lack of planning to protect ‘stocks for the future’ (Stiglitz et al. 2010). It is undeniable that the approach to development needs to respect the environment. It is pointless for Held to say that the philosophy underpinning the consensus cannot be blamed on John Williamson (Held 2005, p. 8) who developed the neoliberal theory about the free market, because the way it has been applied no longer applies to his original ideas.

According to the Australian foreign minister, Rudd,⁴²:

... [t]he crucible for China’s rising role in the world is where the new regional institutions underpinned by shared international values will be needed to craft principles and practices of common security and common property for the future. In the past, Asia has had no such institutions with the mandate or the membership to discharge this function. But with the expansion of the East Asia Summit last November to include the US (and Russia), we have all the main powers of this region around a single table at summit level with an open mandate on political, economic and security issues. And this for the first time in Asia’s history. Confidence building and security—building measures, greater military transparency, common responses to natural disaster management (the greatest scourge for people of this region) as well as common regional commitments to open economies and sustainable development are now possible. For the first time, we have it within our grasp to fashion a credible, new Pax Pacifica may ultimately be translatable into wider peace, should Washington’s relative global power continue to decline. Importantly, at present, no one in Asia is seeking to replace Pax America with a Pax Sinica. Workable multilateral, rules based orders are in a different category altogether, in which all legitimate stakeholders share responsibility for upholding the order.

The market failures (Held 2005, p. 15) and the criticisms of the market fail to recognize that the problem is not only the so-called ‘externalities’ that are not factored into calculations of social and environmental degradation—it is a way of thinking and ‘being in the world.’

The short-term gains of shifting the extraction of profit to where labour is cheaper and where governments and citizens are less likely to complain about degradation of environment provide only a temporary gain. The collapse of the factory in Bangladesh is a case in point. Short-term profits are made at the expense of current

⁴² Rudd, K. 2012 ‘West not ready for new China’, *Inquirer The Weekend Australian* July 14–14, p. 16.

and future generations. Examples of unsustainability abound, from the collapse of factories that are not maintained, because it would diminish profits has led to the deaths of 1000 garment workers in Bangladesh (Hammadi and Kelly 2013).⁴³

This undermines the conditions of employment so that full-time employment becomes less available. The globalized market needs post-national controls to ensure control of the movement funds (see McIntyre-Mills 2011). Enabling a transformation of identity through consciousness raising, humility and governance is the challenge for ethical systemic governance which has become increasingly difficult in the wake of the convergent crises. Morality becomes politically disposable, because of a lack of understanding of our interconnected existence.

1.6.2 Productivity: Implications for Uncertainty and Wellbeing, Not Profit

If we are concerned about wellbeing, we need to realize that the concept of scarcity is foreign only to the privileged elites who make decisions on behalf of others. For the poor, scarcity is a way of life. Nurturing scarce resources in a frugal way is normal and the norm:

It could be argued that our descendants may become very sensitive to relative scarcity of some environmental goods to which we pay little attention today because they are still relatively abundant, and that this requires that we immediately place a high value on these items just because we think that our descendants may wish to do so. (Stiglitz et al. 2010, pp. 123–124)

I was struck by the billboards and rising skylines in Jakarta. One of the first billboards I saw on leaving the airport was an advert for a ‘prosperity burger,’ a hamburger on a white roll. The rice dishes cost a fraction of the price of a hamburger in a fast food outlet.

⁴³ Hammadi, S and Kelly, A 2013 Bangladesh’s stark lesson for buyers. Guardian Weekly 17.05.13, p. 44.



Photography by author, taken in 2012 in Jakarta

The commonly used statistics [of wellbeing] may not be capturing some phenomena, which have an increasing impact on the wellbeing of citizens. For example traffic jams may increase GDP as a result of the increased use of gasoline, but obviously not the quality of life... (Stiglitz et al. 2011, p. 3)

The notion of accounting and accountability needs to be made clear and transparent through systems of governance and democracy that are governed by laws to protect the global commons.⁴⁴

People need to be free and diverse to the extent that their freedom and diversity do not undermine the next generation of life. This maxim needs to be upheld locally, regionally and globally in overlapping biospheres.

⁴⁴ Corruption is stealing from the next generation of life, not merely from the state, market or civil society. Here is an example that illustrates the point I am making. The Jakarta Post (March 3rd, 2012) highlighted the case of 33 law makers sent to jail who were involved in the election of Miranda S. Goelton for bribery, involving travelers checks to enable buying oil plantations in North Sumatra. 'Nunan attends first trial session for bribery.'



Photography by author, taken in 2010 on the Cape Flats, South Africa

Unemployment has remained high in SA and 48% of the population is unemployed. The destitute recyclers on the Cape Flats have demonstrated an ability to live with a low-carbon footprint.

The governance gaze from above needs to be balanced by monitory democracy from below. Lessons from nature could help restore a respect for biodiversity and a realization of our place within the biosphere.

The global commons needs to be supported by laws to protect the collective good.

The doorways of shops on Kuta Beach, Bali, Indonesia, for example, are protected from the evil of violence and worst aspects of globalization. Offerings are given as people enter and leave their homes and businesses. The gateways or portals from one way of being to another do need protection by recognizing the sacred and the value of the non-material world. The theatre state (Geertz 1980) has allowed the theatre of tourism to overrun the fabric of life. The bombings orchestrated by fundamentalist Islam lead to a sense of widespread abhorrence for extremism and a response from Jakarta (Vickers 2005, p. 218) that clearly emphasizes religious freedoms as a core aspect of Pancasila in the Indonesian constitution.

In Bali, it is increasingly recognized by environmentalist that it is not the tourists who are solely to blame for the degradation of a way of life—but the greed of those who forget that Balinese need to protect the land and remember that the Hindu temple was always central to village life and the sharing of water.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ People are reminded of their relationships with nature. Large trees are swathed in black and white banners and entrances are swathed. The desecration of Bali through creating a continuous

The Subak system was the basis of life. The central power of the state and an acknowledgement of the centrality of the temple and water have been forgotten in the jostle to achieve status and power. This is a recurring theme that was always part of Balinese and other human cultures.



Appreciating the natural environment as sacred. Photography by author, taken in Denpasar, 2011

Kuta development is currently being raised as an area of concern by those who say that the Hindu spirituality is being ignored in the post-Suharto era. Kuta was historically the area of trade, but now the agricultural land centred on temple, rice agriculture and the Subak system of irrigation that provided the livelihood of Bali are under threat.