



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:

<http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/>

'This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:
McIntyre-Mills, J, 2014. 'Reconsidering boundaries',
Sociopedia, International Sociological Association,

which has been published in final form at:

[http://www.sagepub.net/isa/admin/viewPDF.aspx?
&art=Reconsidering%20Boundaries%20\(amended\).pdf](http://www.sagepub.net/isa/admin/viewPDF.aspx?&art=Reconsidering%20Boundaries%20(amended).pdf)

Made available in accordance with the publisher's terms.

© 2014 The Author

Reconsidering boundaries

Janet McIntyre-Mills

Flinders University, South Australia

University of Indonesia

Key words: inclusion, exclusion, framing, participatory democracy, participatory governance

Abstract: The critical reflection aims to identify the need to recognize our interconnectedness and to reframe the nation state. I provide a brief outline of the landscape of the complex field, defined by intersections spanning social, cultural, political, economic and environmental contributions from the social and natural sciences. A case is made for those who are not protected by the social contract, including young people, non-citizens, the disabled, sentient beings and the environment on which we all depend. The contribution highlights the empirical contradictions and theoretical tensions that have implications for social and environmental justice.

Website: <http://www.isa-sociology.org/publ/sociopedia-isa/>

Theoretical perspectives

Boundaries are sociological constructions. In biological systems the most basic boundary is the membrane of a cell which opens and closes according to context. In the hierarchy of systems (Kenneth Boulding, 1956) biological systems are above inorganic systems because they are a) open and responsive to their environment and b) able to adapt and learn as self-evolving systems (see McIntyre-Mills, 2014 for more details).

The webs of relationships that are fostered across all forms of inorganic and organic life are recognized in physics (Gunaratne, 2009, Thurok, 2012). Each particle is in motion and it is the movement and flows of energy that make life possible. The transfer of information flows across all living systems.

A core capability for sociologists who wish to respond to the complex interconnected social, cultural, political and economic challenges will be the ability to transcend disciplinary boundaries and to work with diverse perspectives. Thus those who inform the argument for this entry include De Waal and Dawkins (primatology and philosophy), Hirschman and Hannah Arendt (on economics and politics), Amartya Sen (on economics and morality), Stuart Hall (on identity) and Martha Nussbaum (on social justice). The work of Stiglitz on wellbeing stocks is extended through drawing on Vandana Shiva (on the intersections spanning economics, politics and the environment).

Sociologists need to work together with many stakeholders who can contribute diverse ways of knowing, including non-anthropocentric approaches informed by an understanding of nature and other life forms. In terms of personal praxis as sociologists it will require our learning the ability to be inclusive by enabling everyone to feel that they are respected and heard. This requires giving time and developing the ability to communicate respectfully across diverse participants in sociological conversations that span diverse cultures, interests, experiences and discipline based knowledge. The focus on anthropocentric humanism and human rights has led to an unethical divide or boundary between the *human and the animal*. The human being is seen as the controller of nature. But the divided nature of *control and compete* is only one part of the story. The continuum of relationships with nature and with animals needs to be seen as co-evolving. *Co-operation and nurturing* is the other side of the story. Recognizing the connections across the stereotypical feminine and the masculine principles of empathy and connecting versus conflict and competition and that these approaches to social engagement are both important for evolution (Fowler and Christakis, 2010).

Primates evolved through their ability to form bonds of trust in groups as a result of reciprocity and these basic pillars of morality are based on empathy and reciprocity (De Waal, 2009a, b). Co-operation and nurturing is equally important when designing social policy to address the big issues of the day, namely poverty and climate change that will affect biospheres that span national boundaries. Identity is a matter not merely of biology and self-perception, but also social interaction and a sense of self.

The ability to draw the line in social systems needs to be based on decisions that are made on the basis of questioning what to include or exclude. Just as cells can open or close to allow in nutrients and to expel toxins, boundaries need to be open or closed according to context in social systems. This requires considering our values and realizing that we see the world in terms of these values.

We are the boundaries according to Haraway (1991, 1992, and 2010). She exhorts those without a voice *to be the designers*. We can choose to destroy the environment or to be stewards based on re-wiring our brains through thinking about our thinking, co-operating and nurturing.

Space, time and identity are changing as our awareness of interconnectivity is re-discovered.

The work of Stuart Hall et al (1996, 1997) on cultural identity and representation discussed the diversity within the modern state and stressed the need to consider the way resources are distributed and consumed within nation states by asking: What is the social, cultural, economic and environmental context? Who gets what, when, why and so what?

The implications of greed and lavish consumption on others and the environment

The *will* to make a difference is the challenge, according to David Held, (2005: 33-34) who calculates the amounts in American dollars required to make a difference to the life chances of others:

“We may lack the will but it cannot be said that we lack the means. ...What do we require to make a substantial difference to the basic wellbeing of the world’s poorest? Again the statistics are available. ..Required would be \$6 billion per annum on basic education, 9 billion per annum for water and sanitation, 12 billion per annum for the reproductive health of women, 13 billion per annum for basic health nutrition...These figures are substantial, but when judged against the major consumption expenditure in the US and EU they are not beyond our reach. Moreover if all the OECD agricultural subsidies were removed and spent on the world’s poorest peoples this would release some 300 billion per annum ...In addition a small shift between military and aid budgets- 900 billion and 50 billion a year globally would make a marked difference to the human security agenda....”

But the Sydney Peace Prize winner Vandana Shiva (2002) sums up the challenge for this century as one of *preventing* the commodification of life and stresses the need to learn from nature and across disciplinary specialisations.

The ability to see the big picture in terms of what we value and why ranging from social thinkers to physicists should be encouraged:

“all the indications are that the universe is at its simplest at the smallest and the largest scales.....One can draw further parallels with the selfish, individualistic behaviours that are often the root cause of our environmental and financial crises. Within physics I see the idea of a ‘multiverse’ as a similarly fragmented perspective, representing a loss of confidence in the prospects for basic science. Yet I believe all of these crises will ultimately be helpful if they force us, like the quantum physicist, to remake our world in more basic and far sighted ways....If we can only link our intelligence to our hearts, the doors are wide open to a brighter future, to a more unified planet...to quantum technologies that extend our perception....” (Thurok, 2012: 256-257)

According to Shiva (1988, 2002, 2011) multinational companies and the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation have made it possible to patent the conditions of life and to link the so-called Green Revolution in India with terminator seeds that do not self-generate because they have been genetically modified, resulting in spiraling costs associated with the purchasing of seeds and the pesticides needed. (Despite the claims by the manufacturers). Shiva (2011) argues that this has led to many farmers being unable to afford to buy seed and that some are driven to suicide. Shiva argues furthermore that the attempt to criminalize farmers who store old varieties of seed could lead to undermining the seed diversity and that this could lead to increased food insecurity as a result of 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. Palombi (2007) stresses that patents supported by international trade undermine both the developed and the developing world through eroding human and planetary health. Shiva’s (1988) praxis (like Gandhi’s) is to find ways to intervene where it is most needed.

The open democracy forum was the starting point for research in response to David Held’s (2005) proposal shared through Open Democracy that the core challenge of the day is to address the vast differences in standard of living between rich and poor through reforming world trade and using the market to address global warming by means of a global covenant that prevents unilateral interventions. In response to his critics he claims that the resources exist for a reformed United Nations to make a difference, if there was a will. But the UN according to Scruton (2005:47-48) is corrupt, the bureaucrats are overpaid and he argues that national sovereignty is the only way to make a difference through controlling corruption. But nationalist responses fall short of correcting the market failures and Held did not anticipate the extent of the market failures that have actually occurred. The problem is not only concerning externalities that are not factored into calculations of the degradation to the environment, it also involves shifting the extraction of profit to where labour is cheaper and where governments and citizens are less likely to complain about degradation of environment and short term profits at the expense of future generations. This undermines – not only the conditions of employment so that full time employment becomes less available – but also the very fabric of life on which all economic development depends. This is aided by the lack of control of the market and the movement funds (see McIntyre-Mills 2011)

Where to from here? How do we work democratically with this complexity and how do we govern this complexity? Perhaps we merely need a simpler approach, namely recognition that what we do to others and to the environment, we do to ourselves.

Stuart Hall (see Akomfrah, 2013) stresses the notion of identity today as one that requires a long narrative response to explain our origins. Where we live, where our parents live and where we came from and why.

If we accept a strong version of cosmopolitanism along the lines suggested by Martha Nussbaum (2006) in ‘Frontiers of Justice’, then we must accept that immigration is tied to the notion of separate nation states that are no longer relevant.

Empirical evidence to support solidarity and post national regional biospheres

How should we live?

“contentment and experienced wellbeing, in a Benthamite hedonic utility sense? Or do we care about eudaimonia or life purpose, in an Aristotelian sense? ... While scholars surely can measure both, from a societal and policy perspective, which dimension of happiness should policy aim to maximise?” (Graham, 2011:121)

The way in which excessive consumption of energy resources impacts on the size of our carbon footprint (defined in terms of the IPCC formula, namely E (Emissions) = Population X Consumption per person X Energy Efficiency X Energy Emissions.)

The IPCC formula suggests that the privileged lives of some could lead to existential risk for people and the planet (Bostrom, 2011).

This has implications for the way we live and the need to change our way of life through rethinking our relationships with others and the environment. Representation, accountability and sustainability challenges need to be met through addressing consumption choices that are currently very unequal. The gaps between rich and poor, the powerful and the powerless have become wider and wider.

Hirschman (1970) could be characterised as striving to reveal ‘in the small new ways of seeing the whole’ (Adelman, 2013, 9). He contributed to reframing the way in which areas of concern were perceived and the *possibilities* for doing things differently.

In times of crisis – Hirschman (1970) suggested three options – ‘loyalty, voice or exit’. Although it was possible for him to apply all three options to great acclaim in his life time – to exit totalitarian states and to demonstrate alternative ways of doing things, times have changed, because the challenges we face today cannot be addressed by working *within* the boundaries of a nation state or deciding to ‘exit’ a nation state that has become totalitarian.

Currently we need to think critically about taken for granted structures. We need to take the liberative potential of small scale projects (as suggested by Hirschman) and try to think of their potential as a way to do things differently.

In contrast Hannah Arendt (1970) emphasises both potential and risks through drawing attention to evidence of the banality of evil. She considered the broad context and the structures that lead people to make unethical choices.

Arendt’s (1972) work ‘Crisis in the republic’ on how lies and spin contribute to undermining democracy remains relevant as does her report on Eichmann’s trial. Arendt stressed the implications of being part of an unquestioned monstrous system that becomes an unquestioned culture and a taken for granted system of bureaucracy. To avoid taking things for granted it is important to develop critical thinking based on the capability to think at a meta level about the implications of choices (Van Gigch, 2003), but also to have in place constitutional structures that protect social and environmental justice for this generation and the next (Jessop, 2009).

Possibilities and Risks: Constructing and Deconstructing Narratives of the State

How can we achieve cultural transformation on consumption patterns?

There is little doubt that accelerated climate change will adversely affect wellbeing and sustainability in Australia (Flannery, 2005, Pretty, 2013, Stiglitz et al, 2010) – particularly if we continue to consume at current rates (Davies & World Institute, 2008) – resulting in significant devastation and a compromised quality of life. The impact of climate change has been underestimated (Lovelock, 2006, 2009, Rockström et al, 2009) and local solutions have been overlooked. Aboriginal cultures teach us about stewardship and relationships with the land, but these relationships have been lost in non-Aboriginal cultures. As Major Sumner, a Ngarrindjeri Aboriginal elder from the periodically drought-ravaged lower Murray River in South Australia and custodian of the river stresses, *we are the land and the land is us*. Re-establishing relationships with the land is at the heart of effective cultural ecosystem management (see <http://www.mdba.gov.au/what-we-do/working-with-others/aboriginal-communities/ringbalin>). There is evidence that many non-aboriginal people desire more environmentally sustainable lives, but little is known about the influences on choices around the management of land, water and food that affect the

environment. Government response to human wellbeing is often based on economic development, which inadvertently increases consumerism, resulting in greater environmental degradation.

Stewardship like all concepts is shaped by assumptions and values. Flannery (2012) considers that stewardship is based on awareness that the land and biologically diverse ecosystems are a cultural heritage on which the wellbeing of current and future generations depends. Anthropocentric versus non-anthropocentric stewardship need to be carefully considered to ensure that human consumption is not at the expense of environmental considerations and future generations of life (Parker, 2012).

Resilience is defined as the adaptive capacity of the physical environment, of an individual or of a group. It concerns factors such as the capacity of members of a community to act together and to be able to modify or even transform, existing ways of life (Rose, 2005, Hulme 2009).

Research needs to draw on diverse ways of knowing (Cruz et al, 2009) that could support regional governance (Wear, 2012) to support effective environmental management.

There is evidence that many desire more environmentally sustainable lives, but little is known about the influences on choices around the management of land, water and food that affect the environment. Government response to human wellbeing is often based on economic development, which inadvertently increases consumerism, resulting in greater environmental degradation. We know, therefore, that environmental sustainability and human wellbeing are intimately linked, but there is little knowledge about how this linkage can be built upon to improve both areas. Attempts to address climate change are often based on policy information that is not grounded in citizen experiences and fails to address what we do know about human behaviour or choices. The inherent link between engagement in civil society and community wellbeing (rather than the economic bottom line) needs to be the focus of research.

The concepts of stewardship and resilience are important notions through which to explore the nexus across wellbeing, consumption choices and the environment.

We need to develop a deeper understanding of how the intangible aspects of perceived wellbeing can be measured. But we also need to measure them in relation to the link between wellbeing and sustainability (Stiglitz et al (2010).

The number of refugees

According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, Antonio Guterres (15 January, 2014):

“Within a few years, Syria has gone from being the world’s second largest refugee-hosting to becoming its fastest refugee producing country....UNHCR has registered far over 2.3 million Syrians as refugees in the region, and governments estimate the total number of those who fled at over 3 million.... Few refugee influxes have generated this profound an impact on their host countries, with dramatic demographic, economic and social consequences. The pressure is felt heavily in all areas of daily life, as budget deficits are increasing, growth suffers and jobs, salaries and price levels are affected across the region, leaving local families struggling to make ends meet”

The discourse above remains rooted in the notion that bounded nation states are inevitable. The argument developed in this paper is that the nation state needs to take as a given that the cosmopolitan human rights come first and that nation states serve regional needs. They need to be seen as part of an overlapping region with responsibility at a regional level for food security and human security. The costs of climate change will place a heavy burden not only on the state but on the surrounding regions.

Benhabib (2007) and Archibugi (2010) stress that instead we need a form of federalist republicanism. But how do we move from the containerist approach that undermines justice through limiting compassion to citizens at the expense of human rights?

Bohman (2005: 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” (cited in McIntyre-Mills, 2014:31) challenges for sociological praxis

The greatest challenges for sociological praxis are the consequences of inaction that will potentially pose an existential risk to humanity. Sociologists need to address these challenges in their research and as policy advisers. The 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.

Strong cosmopolitans such as Archibugi (2010:319) 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: 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 re-distribution of energy resources through governance. Beardsworth (2011:168), for instance 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, 142)”

The problem is that that the greatest emitters per capita 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 (Levins, 2006)?

Held (2005) 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.

The market failures Held (2005: 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). By recognizing that we are part of overlapping biospheres, rather than competing nation states a way forward may be possible. But 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 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 under tapped as stressed in this chapter and other research on wellbeing, representation, accountability and sustainability (McIntyre-Mills and de Vries, 2011, 2012).

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: 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), 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.

Arguments for and against the national, transnational and supra national organisations 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 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 wellbeing. No community can be expected to transform from a high carbon life style (or aspiring to this life style) 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).

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?

How can governance protect the global commons and the collective good (see HM Government 2005)? How can complex social, economic and environmental challenges that are perceived differently by different stakeholders with different values be addressed? Florini (2003) suggests the potential of the Aarhus convention could be scaled up to enhance accountability. It is taken for granted these days that the silo approach to the nation state is acceptable. But given the entangled nature of globalisation and the need to protect the global commons we can no longer address socio-economic and environmental challenges within bounded areas.

In an era of social, economic and environmental convergence of risk we need to accept the possibility of new forms of governance to protect those who are not protected by the nation state, because they are not citizens. The work of Ann Florini provides possibilities as does the work of Danielle Archibugi.

The challenges of governance need to be addressed by working across disciplines. Gibbons et al (1994) argue that the ability to work across boundaries is vital for 'The new production of knowledge' and vital for '*the dynamics of research*' to address current complex challenges.

The so-called 'tragedy of the commons' argument developed by Hardin (1968) is a construction informed by simplistic thinking. Ironically it is often used as the starting point for environmental thinking, but in fact it originated as an argument developed by Locke in support of the enclosure movement and private property in Britain. The argument being that contained areas of land are cared for better than the areas of land that are held in common and shared. The example of common grazing land is shared. But ironically it is the privatization and commodification of land and natural resources that has led to environmental pollution and degradation.

The lack of trust between nations has evoked the rhetoric of nationalism and state protectionism. This has led to 'seeing like a state'(Scott, 1998), which in turn leads to the argument for competition and the zero sum approach which argues that one nation can profit at the expense of others. The organizational philosophy and governance arguments that flow from this philosophy are based on limited disciplinary paradigms that can profit at the expense of others.

Table: Architecture for governance in overlapping domains to maximize changes towards a more sustainable future

	Structure	Process	Action
Micro- level Individuals	Capabilities of human and sentient beings protected at the local level. Their rights to quality of life and the responsibility to protect decent standards through local structures and the principle of subsidiarity and stewardship through an adapted form of Aarhus convention (see Florini, 2003, Nussbaum and Glover, 1995, Nussbaum, 2006)	Questions raised and posed to local government by individuals	Local government, NGOS and individuals (see Florini, 2003)
Meso States and regions	Aarhus convention (1998) Linked to Global Covenant	Monitory democracy and governance to address state/market/civil society concerns from below (Keane, 2009)	Networking NGOs and INGOS to address representation and accountability(Gaventa, 2001, Carens,1995)
Macro Cosmopolitan governance	Legal structures to protect the global commons and social justice (Haydon, 2010). Structures to support the	International Criminal Court and United Nations to support 'world environmental citizenship' Haydon,	Global action to pass laws to protect social and environmental justice in overlapping biospheres informed by legal imagination and

	Global Covenant such as a scaled up Aarhus convention and Biospheres Convention	2010).	social engagement (Fourade and Savelsburg,2006).
--	---	--------	---

Source: Adapted from Archibugi (in Wallace Brown and Held, 2010: 322 cited in McIntyre-Mills et al 2014 in press)

Ideally, a universal respect for social and environmental justice could enable subsidiarity as a means to support freedom (Follesdale, 2006, Poe, 2010) to the extent that it does not undermine the quality of life of this generation or the next.

Dualist thinking pervades our consciousness and is reflected in socially unjust and environmentally unsustainable designs for society.

Designs need to be supported by constitutions, based on *a priori norms*, and consequentialist or *a posteriori approaches*, based on testing out ideas within context and with future generations in mind.

Global axioms to protect future generations and the poor of this generation need to guide legal constructs and legal decisions at the local level.

The principle of subsidiarity could rest comfortably with global axioms – provided that the caveat is made that – *people at the local level can be free and diverse to the extent that their freedom and diversity does not undermine the rights of others or future generations of life.*

This challenge of balancing individual and collective social, cultural, political and economic concerns needs to be buttressed by regional parliaments and courts that focus on social and environmental justice at a post national level.

The desire of the rich to consume and the desire of the majority of the poor to leave the ghetto are expressed through emulating the rich.

On the one hand, socio-demographic research shows that debt and bankruptcy in developed nations – such as the USA and nations within the EU – are driven by advertising, easy credit and the desire to ‘keep up appearances’ by emulating the standards of the very rich (Frank, 2007, Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009).

Making and invoking treaties and conventions that control commodification needs to be a priority and needs to be ongoing if justice is to be maintained. The approach could be buttressed through federations supported by, for 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 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 disenchanted for a number of reasons.

Discussion of future directions

Wellbeing is now widely located in mainstream transdisciplinary literature that re-frames what we value as a society, hence research needs to build on the work of Joseph Stiglitz, Amartya Sen, Ann Florini, Danielle Archibugi, Yoland Wadsworth, Deborah Rose Bird, Mike Hulme, Carol Graham and Jenneth Parker of the Schumacher Institute, for example (see Parker, 2013, Schumacher, 1973).

Significant research needs to contribute to developing insight and foresight. It needs to strive to foster and manage diverse forms of knowledge including verbal, visual, physical, musical, mathematical, introspective and interpersonal (Bounfour and Edvinssen, 2005, Gardner, 2008) and thus develop human capacity to address complex socio-environmental challenges (Ehrlich and Ehrlich, 2013).

Democracy is in need of improvement (Hulme, 2009, Giddens, 2009). The specific challenge is to match forms of appropriate stewardship participation that are accessible to diverse groups and not viewed with cynicism (Cooke, 2004). What are so-called wicked problems? What are so-called tame problems? Why is it problematic to think of taming or tacking problems as opposed to recognising our need to live in harmony with others and the environment?

The Australian Public Service Commission 2007 report entitled: ‘Taming Wicked Problems’ is problematic. So-called wicked problems comprise many diverse variables that are entangled and that are viewed differently by diverse stakeholders (Flood & Carson 1993, Flood, R. & Romm, 1996, Rittel and Webber, 1984). But the notion of ‘tackling wicked problems’ needs to be critically analysed in terms of the unexamined policy discourses. The complexity of wicked social, economic and environmental challenges need to be informed by the contributions of trans disciplinary research that takes into account the rights of the voiceless and 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 based on re-thinking notions of boundaries based on perceptions of ‘purity and danger’ (Douglas, 1978) . This means that participatory action research is perhaps one of the greatest contributions made by cosmopolitan researchers.

In Flannery’s (2012) Quarterly Essay on Australia’s extinction crisis many wicked problems are raised about our attitudes to stewardship. In his book ‘The Future Eaters’ he explains that we have eliminated many of the herbivores that used to provide the manure for our land. As the land deteriorates and dries out, it becomes more vulnerable to bush fires. The Aboriginal use of fire management to reduce fuel load in the less hot months helped to reduce the risks. Flannery (2012: 54) explains their vital role in protecting the land. Stewardship activities such as reducing fuel load protect not only the environment but also the creatures that live in it. Without stewardship we all become increasingly vulnerable. He criticises the tendency to polarise green politics and sustainability through politics. Sustaining the social and environmental fabric of which we are part ought to underpin our policy designs.

Participatory action research on democracy and governance to enhance sustainable living and wellbeing are discussed in two volumes (McIntyre-Mills et al 2014) and McIntyre-Mills 2014). These companion volumes explore the suggestion made by Florini (2003) in ‘The Coming New Democracy’ that the Aarhus Convention (1998) on ‘Freedom of Environmental Information and Participation’ could be usefully extended to support the nexus between sustaining human and environmental wellbeing and resilience.

Research needs to break new ground on understanding social and cultural relationships and power dynamics across diverse groups as they relate to wellbeing and environmental stewardship. In particular further praxis is needed to explore the wider potential of Max-Neef’s index (1991) as it relates to sustainability, human capital and capacity building locally and regionally on ways to scale up engagement on the question: How should we live? The Human Development Index needs to support the engagement process and to help people to think about their well-being. It is called the ‘being, having, doing and interacting index’. Their responses need to be used as the basis for developing indicators to:

- Deepen our understanding of how people perceive local climate challenges and experiences (Hulme, 2009; Nazarea, 2006; Vaske 2001)
- Explore the habits and a range of emotions and related behaviours (Hogget, 2010) that potentially shape attitudes towards consumption with a particular focus on discourses about rights and responsibilities.
- Explore the kinds of engagement (narrative, the arts and scenarios) that could encourage people to explore diverse ideas about what constitutes living well through providing opportunities to ‘talk back’ (Hooks, 1989) and
- Explore the extent to which engagement with the land enables participants to identify with movements such as post materialism, slow living, eating local food, reducing energy usage, re-using, recycling and the protection of biodiversity.

Research needs to contribute to the integration of wellbeing and environmental theories to create a meaningful approach to this area. Research needs to explore the perceived implications for vulnerability, wellbeing, resilience and the stewardship of diversity. Interdisciplinary research needs to bring together multiple areas looking for new solutions and new ways to foster awareness of ecosystems (Fisher et al, 2009).

Praxis also needs to examine the impact of participation at the local level (Evans, 2014) through awareness-raising about the implications of consumption choices on wellbeing and ‘wellbeing stocks’ (Stiglitz et al, 2010).

Finally, research needs to contribute to developing insight and foresight. How can we increase engagement in the environment that balances individual and collective wellbeing and simultaneously protects the environment when we know little about this nexus? Stewardship for future generations underpin the philosophy of Aboriginal custodians of the land and their dreaming sites. However, there is evidence that many non-Aboriginal urban citizens wish to spend more time living slower lives, walking wherever possible, riding bikes, growing local food, recycling and re-using and consuming less, instead of living stressful, competitive lives that save time, but waste resources as they are reliant on fast food in ‘throw away’ containers, fast travel and a ‘time is money attitude’ (McIntyre-Mills et al, 2012, 2013, 2014 forthcoming). These findings clearly link environmental health and human wellbeing and raise the question of what can we learn from mobile and egalitarian, place-attached people (Vaske and Kobrin, 2001) whose history is recorded in the landscape? (Guddemi, 2006, Rose, 2004).

Research needs to re-discover stewardship rights and responsibilities (Flannery, 2012) and to become accountable. These goals are considered essential for the governance of sustainable resources by Ann Florini (2003) and Carol Graham (2011) of the Brookings Institute. More applied research is needed at the interface of capacity building, knowledge and biodiversity management, consciousness studies and systemic governance (McIntyre-Mills, 2006, 2010, 2014) in order to contribute to new ways to address the systemic social, economic and environmental challenges we face today.

The tension between ‘the fox and the hedgehog’ remains (to draw on Berlin, 1959 and Crowder, 2003). The wily fox is pragmatic and learns from experience. The hedgehog defends itself according to a single tactic and one grand theory about the world. In re-considering boundaries, it is necessary to steer away from hedgehog approaches and try to remain open to experiences.

Testing out ideas requires preserving freedom, space for doubt, diversity and disagreement to the extent that diversity does not undermine the right to the freedoms of others.

An open approach to design and to research could be extended through acknowledging the praxis knowledge associated with reading the environment and living systems of which we are part. Research needs to span consciousness, cultural studies and systemic praxis to link the notion of relationships between humans and the land as a source of wellbeing and the broader societal need for environmental protection and effective ecosystem management.

The consumption of resources

The challenges are to address planetary issues. Thus when framing research it is important to realise that the wellbeing of individual citizens cannot be protected unless the global commons is protected (H.

Research needs to address a different approach to the way in which we live our lives in terms of our consumption of energy resources, fresh water, transport and meat consumption and the implications for wellbeing and sustainable living (Pretty (2013).

New local forms of engagement and governance (Held 2004) are needed to protect residents against environmental hazards and the subsequent economic and social consequences. Major challenges in local communities include the need to achieve or maintain: a) Access to safe housing (including energy and water), appropriate education and employment; within b) liveable cities; that are in turn supported by c) sustainable regions. Some scholars (Christakis and Flanagan, 2010, Dryzek, 2010) argue that a lack of cultural understanding about our interlinked and entangled lives affects human rights in so far as it shapes access to water, energy and food security. There is a groundswell of democracy that seeks to save the planet from our consumption choices, but little is known about those consumption choices and what motivates people to consume excessively. It has been argued that after a certain point, increased consumption does not lead to more happiness (Pretty, 2013). Thus, increased consumption, driven by increased economic growth, does not make people happier. Indeed, in more egalitarian societies, all

people consume less and are less status conscious (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009). Thus, the link between greater equality or wellbeing and the prevention of global warming appears to involve ‘limiting consumerism’ (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009: 221). It is assumed that greater social and economic equality will provide the key to reducing the cultural pressure to consume. These are policy challenges locally and regionally that need to be addressed if this agenda is to be advanced. Specifically, it will require balancing individual and community needs to achieve sustainable human rights (Layard, 2006, Nussbaum, 2006, Faist, 2009) within and beyond nation states (Etzioni, 2004, 2012).

‘Transformation from Wall Street to Wellbeing (McIntyre-Mills et al, 2014) discusses current research on an alternative architecture for governance. The concept ‘Wall Street’ is used to symbolise economic rationalism and ‘wellbeing’ to symbolise a re-framed approach to ‘being interconnected’ and through treading lightly (McIntyre-Mills, De Vries and Binchai, 2014, McIntyre –Mills and De Vries, 2012). The participatory action research explores whether the proposed architecture for engagement in participatory democracy and governance (Archibugi, 2010; Gaventa,2001) could enable people to gain greater awareness of the implications of excessive consumption (Pretty, 2012, Urry, 2007, 2010) for stewardship (see Australian Government Caring for Country, 2013-2018). This book argues that social, economic and environmental accounting could be assisted by means of participation to make this so-called triple bottom line accountability viable across the boundaries of nation states. Thus the participatory action research grasps the nettle to: “address 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, 368).The challenge to move beyond the rhetoric of cosmopolitan citizenship and to address both justice and sovereignty. The nation state needs to be held to account by an Earth Charter that is supported by overlapping regional institutions (supported by inclusive regional research institutions, policies, the rule of law including parliaments and courts).

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 re-distribution and simpler life styles supported by green economies, reciprocal sharing of resources and skills in green communities, supported by energy efficient systems.

The hypothesis that participation through awareness and consciousness-raising (McIntyre-Mills, 2010) will influence the way in which people think about boundaries. It could help them to remake connections with others and the environment through valuing the environment and engaging in healthy relationships (Wynne, 1996). This hypothesis is based on the notion of neural plasticity in that the brain shapes the environment and, in turn, is shaped by the environment (Bateson, 1972, Beer, 1994, Capra,1996, Greenfield, 2000).

The research tests the principle of subsidiarity, namely that decisions need to be taken at the lowest level possible through the wellbeing and environmental stewardship score card that adapts and extends the Max Neef Human Development Index. The latter provides the architecture for applying the Aarhus Convention (1998) based on the right to participate and the right to freedom of information on issues pertaining to local environmental wellbeing concerns. The engagement architecture that we develop and test enables diverse opinions to be mapped and scored in terms of social, economic and environmental indicators of what works why and how to support personal and environmental wellbeing through exploring perceptions. These perceptions will help policy makers narrow the gap between haves, wants and needs when addressing service delivery.

The companion volume: ‘Systemic Ethics and non-anthropocentric stewardship’ (McIntyre-Mills, 2014) explores the need to develop the capacity to ‘join up the dots’ through participatory democracy and governance and through working across disciplines whilst preserving space for difference, based on the axiom that freedom and diversity needs to be fostered to the extent that it does not undermine the rights of others in this generation or future generations of life.

Hybridity and our connection with the land are understood by Aboriginal Australians. We read our past in the landscape and we create its future through our choices.

Conclusion

A case is made for a new form of democracy and governance that is based on re-considering the boundaries of who is protected and what is valued. Currently the social contract only protects those who fit the criterion of citizen. Young people, non-citizens, the disabled, sentient beings and the environment on which we all depend are not protected by the social contract.

Protection of rights in response to perceived responsibilities to the state does not go far enough, because contractual reciprocity does not protect the vulnerable, the voiceless or the land.

Thus boundaries need to be re-considered to reflect our dependency on one another and the land and to protect the wellbeing of current and future generations of life.

A new architecture for democracy and governance needs to extend solidarity and protection to all forms of life within a region, rather than limiting protection and thus limiting human security which is dependent on biospheres not national boundaries.

Reconsidérer les frontières

Translation by Eric Bouvet <eric.bouvet@flinders.edu.au>

Mots Clés: inclusion, exclusion, recadrage, démocratie participative, gouvernance participative.

Résumé: L'objectif de cette réflexion critique est d'identifier le besoin de reconnaître notre interdépendance et de recadrer l'Etat-Nation. Je propose un bref aperçu d'un domaine complexe, défini par des intersections intégrant des contributions sociales, culturelles, politiques et environnementales provenant des sciences sociales et naturelles. J'argumente en faveur de ceux qui ne sont pas protégés par le contrat social, y compris les jeunes, les non-citoyens, les handicapés et les êtres sensibles, et en faveur de l'environnement dont nous dépendons tous. Cette contribution met en évidence des contradictions empiriques et des tensions théoriques qui ont des répercussions sur la justice sociale et environnementale.

Reconsiderando las fronteras

Translation by Luciana Souza <dralucianacsouza@gmail.com>

Palabras clave: Inclusión, Exclusión, Elaboración, Democracia participativa, Gobernanza participativa.

Resumen: La reflexión crítica se propone identificar la necesidad de reconocer nuestra interconectividad y de redefinir el Estado-nación. Yo proporciono un breve trazado del paisaje del campo complejo, definido por las intersecciones que abarcan las contribuciones sociales, culturales, políticas, económicas y ambientales de las ciencias sociales y naturales. Un caso se hace para aquellos que no están protegidos por el contrato social, incluidos los jóvenes, los no ciudadanos, los discapacitados, los seres sensibles y el medio ambiente del que todos dependemos. La contribución destaca las contradicciones empíricas y las tensiones teóricas que tienen implicaciones para la justicia social y ambiental.

Annotated further reading

Read the following on identity, representation and for a sense of who we are and with what and whom we identify

Beck, U. 2010, 'Climate for change, or how to create a green modernity'. *Theory, Culture and Society*. 27(2-3):254-266
Butler, J. with Taylor, S. *Interdependence*. In Taylor, A 2009. *Examined Life: excursions with contemporary thinkers*. The New Press. New York.

These references argue for the need to re-evaluate economics in order to enhance accountability and sustainability

Stiglitz, J. Sen, A. And Fitoussi, J.P. 2010, *Mis-measuring our lives: why the GDP doesn't add up*. The New Press. New York,
Shiva, V 2002, *Water wars: privatization, pollution and profit*, London, Pluto Press.

Read the following for an appreciation that democracy and governance challenges are connected to everyday choices

- Habermas, J. Derrida, J and Borradori, G. 2003, *Philosophy in a time of terror Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nussbaum, M., 2006, *Frontiers of Justice*, London. Harvard University Press.
- Kirby, M. 2013, *What would Ghandi do?* Penguin: New York

Consider the above for a sense of the importance of empathy and recognizing our interconnectedness and our interdependence

- Burns, D. 2007, *Systemic Action Research. A Strategy for whole system change*. Bristol. Policy Press.
- De Waal, F. 2009, *The Age of Empathy nature's lessons for a kinder society*. Harmony.

References

- Akomfrah, J. 2013 'The Stuart Hall Project: Revolution, politics, culture and the New Left Experience'. . Documentary produced by David Lawson & Lina Gopaul. Directed by John Akomfrah.
- Aarhus Convention 1998, 'On access to information. Public participation and access to justice in environmental matters', Denmark, 25 June. <http://aarhusclearinghouse.unece.org/resources.cfm?c=1000069>
- Archibugi, D. 2008, 'The architecture of cosmopolitan democracy' in *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Towards Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Princeton University Press and also Archibugi, D. 2010. 'The architecture of cosmopolitan democracy', in Brown, G.W. and Held, D. Eds. 2010, *Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge. Polity Press
- Arendt, H. 1959, *The human condition* New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Arendt, H. 1963. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil*. New York: Viking Press.
- Arendt, H. 1967. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London. Allen and Unwin.
- Arendt, H. 1972, *Crises of the Republic*. Harcourt Brace, Orlando. First published in 1969.
- Australian Public Service Commission 2007, *Tackling Wicked Problems: A Public Policy Perspective*. Australian Public Service, Canberra
- Bateson, G., 1972, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, Ballantine, New York.
- Bausch, K. 2006, 'Be your enemy: The Contributions of West Churchman to Doing Better Governance and International Relations' in McIntyre-Mills, J. *Rescuing the Enlightenment from Itself: Critical and Systemic Implications for Democracy*, C. West Churchman Series, Vol. 1, Springer, New York, Boston, London.
- Beardsworth, R. 2011, *Cosmopolitanism and international relations theory*. Polity. Cambridge.
- Beer, S. 1974, *Designing Freedom*, Wiley, London.
- Beer, S. 1994, 'Governance or government' in *Beyond Dispute: the invention of team synergy*. Wiley. London.
- Beer, S., 1975, *Platform for Change*, Wiley, New York.
- Bell, G. 2009, *Getting connected, staying connected*. Department of Premier and Cabinet, South Australia.
- Benhabib, S. 2007, 'Twilight of Sovereignty or the emergence of cosmopolitan norms'? Rethinking citizenship in volatile times. *Citizenship Studies* vol.11 no 1 19-36.
- Benhabib, S. 2004, 'On the existential question that moves her scholarly and political life' <http://globetrotter.berkleu.edu/people4/Benhabib/> Accessed 27/07/2012.
- Berlin, I. 1953, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Bohman, J. 2005, 'The democratic minimum: is democracy a means to global justice?' *Ethics and International Affairs*. 19.no1 101-115.
- Bohmann, J. and Lutz-Bachman Eds. 1997, *Perpetual Peace: essays on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal*. Cambridge MIT press.
- Bonanno, G. 2004, 'Loss Trauma, and Human Resilience'. *American Psychologist* vol. 59: No 1 20-28.
- Bostrom, N. 2011, 'Existential risk prevention as the most important task for humanity' Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford www.existential-risk.org
- Boulding, K. 1956, 'General Systems Theory – the skeleton of Science' *Management Science*. 2, 197-208.
- Brundtland, G. 1987, <http://www.worldinbalance.net/agreements/1987-brundtland.html> The report "Our Common Future".
- Butler, J. 2005, *Giving an account of oneself*. Fordham University Press.
- Butler, J. 2011, 'Precarious Life: The Obligations of Proximity' 28/05/2011. The Neale Wheeler Watson Lecture 2011, given by Professor Judith Butler. Location: Nobel Museum, Svenska. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KJT69AQDtG>
- Capra, F. 1996, *The web of life: A new synthesis of mind and matter*, Harper Collins.
- Carens, J. 1995, 'Aliens and Citizens: the case for open borders', in *The rights of Minority cultures*, Ed Kymlicka, W. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M. 1998, *The information age: Economy, Society and Identity*. Malden Mass. Blackwell.
- Chevalier, J.M. 2009, *The new energy crisis: climate, economics and Geopolitics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Christakis, A. 2006, 'A retrospective Structural Inquiry into the predicament of Humankind: Prospectus of the Club of Rome'. In McIntyre-Mills, J. Ed. *Rescuing the Enlightenment from Itself. Critical and Systemic Implications of Democracy*, Volume 1 of the 'C. West Churchman and Related Works Series', Van Gigch, J (series editor), Springer, London.
- Christakis, A. and Bausch, K. 2006, *How People Harness their Collective Wisdom and Power to Construct the Future in Collaboratories of democracy*, Information Age. Greenwich.
- Christakis, A. and Flanagan, T. 2010, *The talking point: A collaboration project of 21st Century Agoras*. Information Age Publishing.
- Crossen, T. and Niessen, V. 2007, NGO standing in the European Court of Justice - Does the Aarhus Regulation Open the Door? RECEIL 16 (3) PAGES 332-338. ISSN 09628797 at 332.
- Crowder, G. 2003, 'Hedgehog and fox'. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 38 No 2 (July 2003), 333-77.
- Davies, JB., and World Institute. 2008, *Personal wealth*. Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, R. 2006, *The God Delusion*, Black Swan Berkshire.
- Dean, J. 2009, *Democracy and other neo-liberal fantasies: communicative capitalism and left politics*. Duke University Press. London.
- De Waal, F. 2009, *The Age of Empathy nature's lessons for a kinder society*. Harmony.
- Douglas, M. 1978, *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Dryzek, J. 2010, *Green democracy*, Cunningham Lecture Series, ANU, Occasional Paper.
- Du Gay, P. 2005, 'Bureaucracy and Liberty: State, Authority and Freedom' in *The values of democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Elkington, J. 1994, 'Globalisation's reality checks' in Held, H et al *Debating globalization*, Polity. Cambridge.
- Elkington, J., 1997, *Cannibals with forks*, Oxford. Capstone.
- Elliot, A. and Urry. J. 2010, *Mobile Lives*. Routledge, New York.
- Elliot, A. 2002, 'Beck's sociology of risk: a critical assessment'. *Sociology*. 36: 293-315
- Elliot, A. 2012, 'Life on the Move: Mobilities in a Global Age'. Public Lecture, Flinders University 19th June. Victoria Square.
- Ehrlich, P and Ehrlich, 2013. A. 'Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?' *Proc of the Royal Society of Biological Sci.* 280, 20122845
- Etzioni, A. 2004, *From Empire to Community: A New Approach to International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Etzioni, A. 2012, 'The domestic sources of global adhococracy'. *Social Change Review* 10, Issue 2, December 2012.
- Evans, M. 2013, 'Confronting insecure employment' in *Advocate* Vol. 20, No 3. p28.
- Faist, T. 2009, 'The transnational social question'. *International Sociology*. 24: 17-36.
- Flanagan, T. and Bausch, K. 2011, *A democratic approach to sustainable futures. A workbook for addressing the global problematique*. Ongoing Emergence Press. Riverdale.
- Flannery, T. 2005, *The weather makers. The history and future impact of climate change*. Text Publishing, Melbourne.
- Flannery, T. 2010, *Here on earth. An argument for hope*. Text Publishing. Melbourne
- Flannery, T. 2012, 'After the Future: Australia's New Extinction Crisis'. *Quarterly Essay* Issue 48
- Flood, R. & Carson, E. 1993, *Dealing with Complexity: An Introduction to the Theory and application of Systems Science*, 2nd ed., Plenum, London.
- Flood, R. & Romm, N. 1996, *Diversity management: triple loop learning*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Florini, A., 2003, *The Coming Democracy*. Island Press, Washington DC.
- Flyvberg, B. 1998, 'Habermas and Foucault'. *British Journal of Society*. 49 (2): 200-232
- Folke, C. 2006, 'Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses'. *Global Environmental Change* 16 253-267.
- Follesdal, A. 2006, 'Subsidiarity, Democracy and Human Rights in Europe'. *Journal of Social Philosophy*. 37 (1):61-80.
- Foucault, M. and Gordon, C. 1980, Eds., *Power/Knowledge*. Harvester. Brighton.
- Fougere, G. 2007, 'Wellbeing is an idea whose time has come.' *New Opportunities for Health Impact Assessment in New Zealand public policy and planning. The Public Health Advisory Committee*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Fourade, M. And Savelsburg, J. 2006, 'Global Processes, National Institutions, Local Bricolage: shaping law in an era of globalisation'. *Law and Social Inquiry*. Vol. 31.3, pp. 515-519.
- Fowler, J.H. and Christakis, N. 2010, 'Cooperative Behavior Cascades in Human Social Networks.' *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107(9): 5334-5338.
- Frank. R.H. 2007, *Falling behind: how rising inequality harms the middle class*, Berkley, CA. California Press.
- Gandhi, L. 1966, *Affective communities: anti-colonial thought, fin-de-siècle radicalism and the politics of friendship*, Duke University Press. Melbourne.
- Gaventa, J. 2001, 'Global Citizen Action: Lessons and Challenges' in Edwards, M. and Gaventa, J. eds. *Global Citizen Action*. Lynne Rienner. Boulder.
- Getano Lui, 1993, *Voices from the Land*. Boyer lecture Series.
- Gibbons, M. Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London. Sage.
- Giddens, A. 2009, *The politics of climate change*. Polity. Cambridge
- Gould, C. 2007, 'Transnational Solidarities' *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 38(1), 148-164.
- Gouldner, A.W. 1971, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. London. Heinemann.

- Graham, C. 2011, *The pursuit of happiness: an economy of well-being*. Brookings Institution Press. Washington.
- Greenfield, 2003, *Tomorrow's People How 21st Century Technology is changing the way we think and feel*. Penguin
- Greenfield, S. 2000, *The private life of the brain: emotions, consciousness and the secret of the self*. Wiley. New York
- Greenfield, S. 2008, *ID: The quest for meaning in the 21st century*. Sceptre, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Greenwald, G. 2012, 'New York's top court highlights the meaninglessness and menace of the term 'terrorism'' <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/dec/16/court-terrorism-morales-gangs-meaningless>.
- Guddemi, P. 2006, 'Human views of ecological nature'. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*. 12(1): 86-90.
- Gunaratne, S.A. 2009. Globalization: a Non Western perspective: the bias of social science/communication oligopoly. *Communication, Culture and Critique* (2) 60-82.
- Haraway, D. 1991, *The reinvention of nature*. Free Association Books. London.
- Haraway, D. 1992, 'The promises of monsters: a regenerative politics for inappropriated others. *Cultural Studies*'. In Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies*, (New York; Routledge, pp. 295-337.
- Haraway, D. 2010, 'Speculative fabulations for technoculture's generations: taking care of unexpected country', Australian University E press. http://epress.anu.edu.au/guidelines/author_guidelines.html
- Hardin, G. 1968, 'The Tragedy of the Commons', *Science*, 162:1243-1248.
- Hayden, P. 2010, 'The environment, global justice and world environmental citizenship'. In Brown, G.W. and Held, D. *Cosmopolitanism*, Polity Cambridge
- Held, D. et al. 2005, *Debating Globalization*. Polity Cambridge.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton. 1999, *Global transformations. Politics Economics and Culture*. Stanford University Press. Stanford California
- Held, D. 2004, *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus*. Polity.
- Heller, P. 2001, 'Moving the state: the politics of democratic decentralisation in Kerela, South Africa, and Porto Alegre'. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 29 No 1 131-163
- Heycox, J., Meadows, P. and Vernon, B. 1997, 'Environment and Energy Statistics Section Australian Bureau of Statistics. Measuring environmental expenditures and revenues in Local Government', Australian Centre for Regional & Local Government Studies Working Paper No 2. University of Canberra
- Hirschman, A.O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University press
- HM Government 2005, 'Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development'. Strategy Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs by Command of Her Majesty, March 2005. HMSO: St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich.
- Hobbes, T. Leviathan, <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hobbes/thomas/h68l/index.html> accessed 25/06/2012
- Hobson-West, P. 2007, 'Beasts and Boundaries: an introduction to animals in sociology', *Science and Society. Qualitative Sociology Review*. Vol. 3 Issue 1. 23-41
- Hoggett, P. 2010, *Politics, Identity and Emotion*. Paradigm, Boulder.
- Hooks, b. 1989, *Talking Back*. Boston. South End.
- Horvath, Z. and Odor, B. The Union after Lisbon. The treaty reform of the EU. HVG-ORAC Publishing. Hungary. <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-12-23-baubock-en.html> Accessed 19 December, 2012.
- Hulme, M. 2009, *Why we disagree about climate change*. Cambridge. University Press
- Hulme, M. 2010, 'Cosmopolitan Climates. Hybridity, Foresight and meaning'. *Theory, Culture and Society*. Vol. 27 (2-3): 267-276.
- Hulme, M. 2011, 'Climate Change and four narratives of growth'. AHTC Workshop. University of Cambridge. <http://climatehistories.innerasiaresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Mike-Hulme.pdf>. Accessed 8 Feb 2011.
- International Commission on the Future of Food and Agriculture 2007 Manifesto on the future of seeds www.future-food.org
Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3072534> 10.2307/3072534.
- Irvin, R. Stansbury, J. 2002, 'Citizen participation in decision making'. *Public Administrative Review*. Vol. 64:1:55-65.
- Irvine, L. 2007, 'The question of Animal Selves: implications for sociological knowledge and practice'. *Qualitative Sociology Review*. Vol. 3 Issue 1. 5-22.
- Jasonoff, S. 2003, 'Technologies of humility: citizen participation' in governing science. *Minerva*. 41:223-44.
- Jessop, S. 2009, 'Children's participation: an Arendtian criticism'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. Vol. 43. No 9 Article first published online: 8 NOV 2009 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00560.x.
- Kabeer, N & Subrahmanian, R 1996, 'Institutions, relations and outcomes: framework and tools for Gender-Aware Planning', Institute of Development Studies *Discussion Paper*, No. 357, Brighton, UK.
- Keane, J. 2009, *The life and death of democracy*. Simon and Schuster. London.
- Levin, S. 2006, 'Learning to live in a global commons: socioeconomic challenges for a sustainable environment'. *Ecological Research* 21:328-333.
- Lovelock, J. 2006, *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth Is Fighting Back – and How We Can Still Save Humanity*. Santa Barbara (California): Allen Lane.
- Lovelock, J. 2009, *The Vanishing Face of Gaia: A Final Warning: Enjoy It While You Can*. Allen Lane.
- Mathews, F. 2010, 'Planet Beehive'. *Australian Humanities Review - Issue 50*: 159-178
- Mathews, F. 1991, *The ecological self*. London. Routledge.

- Maturana, H. R. & Varela, F. J. 1987, *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. New Science Library, London: Shambhala.
- Max-Neef, M. 1991, *Human Scale Development*. Apex. London.
- Meadows, D. & Randers, J., 1992, *Beyond the Limits. Global Collapse of a Sustainable Future*, Earthscan Publications, London.
- Midgley, G. 2000, *Systemic Intervention: Philosophy, Methodology, and Practice*. Kluwer. New York.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. 2000, *Global Citizenship and Social Movements: Creating Transcultural Webs of Meaning for the New Millennium*. The Netherlands: Harwood.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. 2003, *Critical Systemic Praxis*. The Contemporary Systems Series Kluwer, UK.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. Editor 2006a, *Rescuing the Enlightenment from Itself: Critical and Systemic Implications for democracy*. C. West Churchman Series, Vol. 1. Springer. London. ISBN -10 0-387 27587-8, ISBN -10: 0387-27589-4(e book)
- McIntyre-Mills, J. 2006b, *Systemic Governance and Accountability: working and re-working the conceptual and spatial boundaries of international relations and governance*. C. West Churchman Series, Vol. 3. Springer. London.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. Bausch, K, Christakis, A and De Vries, 2008. 'How can we Break the Mould? Democracy, Semiotics and Regional Governance'. *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*, Vol. 25pp: 305-321
- McIntyre-Mills, J. 2009, 'Ethics, boundaries and sustainable futures'. In *Systemic development: local solutions in a global environment*. Edited by Sheffield, J. ISCE Publishing, and Litchfield, USA.
- McIntyre-Mills, J 2010, 'Wellbeing, mindfulness and the global commons'. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. 17, (7-8) 44-72.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. and De Vries, D. 2011 'Identity, democracy and sustainability: facing up to convergent social, economic and environmental challenges'. Emergent Publications. Lichfield Park, USA.
- McIntyre-Mills, J. 2012a 'Anthropocentricism and wellbeing: a way out of the lobster pot?' *Systems Research and Behavioural Science* Published online in Wiley Online Library. (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/sres.2131
- McIntyre-Mills, J and de Vries, D. 2012. 'Transformation from Wall Street to Well-being' *Systems Research and Behavioural Science* First published online: 10 OCT 2012 DOI: 10.1002/sres.2133
- McIntyre-Mills, J 2014 'Systemic Ethics' *Springer Encyclopaedia of Food Ethics* ISBN 978-94-007-0928-7 in press
- McIntyre-Mills, J with Devries, D and Binchai, N. 2014 'Wall Street to Wellbeing: *Joining up the dots through participatory democracy and governance to mitigate the causes and adapt to the effects of climate change.*' Springer, New York in press
- McIntyre-Mills, J 2014. 'Systemic ethics and non-anthropocentric stewardship: *Implications for transdisciplinarity and cosmopolitan politics* Springer, New York in press
- Murray, J. Dey, C. and Lenzen, M. 2007, 'Systems for Social Sustainability: Global Connectedness and the Tuvalu Test'. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*. Vol. 14 No 1: 87-105.
- Murray_et_al_2006, *Systems for Social Sustainability: Global Connectedness and the Tuvalu Test*. Tuvalu at the Common Wealth Games, Melbourne, 2006. Photograph by Geoff Ludbrook www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/documents/Tuvalu_Test.pdf
- Nazarea, V. 2006. 'Local knowledge and memory in biodiversity conservation', *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol. 36.pp 317-335.
- Nussbaum, M. & Glover, J. 1995, *Women, Culture and Development: A study of Human Capabilities*. Oxford. Clarendon Press
- Nussbaum, M., 2006, *Frontiers of Justice*, London. Harvard University Press.
- Osler, A and Starkeyb, H. 2005, 'Violence in schools and representations of young people: a critique of government policies in France and England', *Oxford Review of Education*. Vol. 31, No.2, June 2005, pp. 195-215
- Palombi, L. 2007, Trips, bilateralism and patents: how they are failing both the developed and the developing world and what to do about it. *Electronic Journal in Communication, Information and Innovation in Health*. V.1 n.1: 71-81
- Parker, J. 2012, 'Transdisciplinary systems approach to paradigm change in sustainable economy' in *The Systemist*, Volume 34, No. 3, Winter 2012, pp138-149
- Parry, M. Rosenzweig, C., Iglesias, A. Fischer, G. and Livermore, M. 1999, 'Climate change and world food security: a new assessment *Global Environmental Change*.S51-S67 Elsevier . Available online 25 October. Accessed February, 7th, 2011.
- Pretty, J. 2013, 'The consumption of a Finite Planet: Well-being, Convergence, Divergence and the Nascent Green Economy'. *Environmental and Resource Economics*. DOI 10.1007/s10640-013-9680-9
- Poe, D. 2010, 'Subsidiarity and the bias for the local', *Journal of Globalisation Studies* Vol. 1.131-140.
- Reason, P. 2002, 'Justice, sustainability and participation', *Concepts and Transformations*, Vol.7 (1): 7-29.
- Ritchey, T. 2011, *Wicked Problems – Social Messes Risk, Governance and Society*, Volume 17, 2011, pp. 1-6
- Rittel, H. and Webber, M. 1984, *Planning problems are wicked problems* *Developments in Design Methodology*. New York: Wiley.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K. 2009, 'A safe operating space for humanity' *Nature* 461: 472-475
- Rose, D.B. 1996 *Nourishing terrains: Australian aboriginal views of landscape and wilderness*. Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra, ACT, BCIN Number: 236409
- Rose, D.B. 2005, 'Dislocating the Frontier' <http://epress.anu.edu.au/dtf/html/frames.php> see <http://epress.anu.edu.au>
- Rose, D.B. 2004, *Reports form a wild country*. University of New South Wales Press. Sydney.
- Rosen, R. 1991, *Life Itself: a comprehensive inquiry into the nature, origin and fabrication of life*. Columbia University Press. New York.
- Schumacher, F.F. 1973, *Small is beautiful. Economics as if people mattered*. Harper and Row. New York.
- Scott, J. 1998 *Seeing like a state*. Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. 2000, *Development as Freedom*, Knopf, New York.

- Sen, A. 2009, *The idea of Justice*. The Belknap Press. Cambridge.
- Shiva, V. 1988 *Staying Alive: women, ecology and development*. South End Press. New York
- Shiva, V. 2002, *Water wars: privatization, pollution and profit*, London, Pluto Press.
- Shiva, V. 2011, *Earth Democracy*, Portland University, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UOfM7QD7-kk/>
- Singer, P., 2002, *One World: The Ethics of Globalisation*, Text Publishers, Melbourne.
- Stanescu, J. 2012, 'Species Trouble: Judith Butler, Mourning, and the Precarious Lives of Animals', *Hypatia* VL - 27, 563-582.
- Steffen, W. Burbridge, A. Hughes, L. Kitching, R., Lindenmayer, D. Musgrave, W. Stafford Smith, M. and Werner, P. 2009, 'Australia's Biodiversity and Climate Change'. *Australian Government*. CSIRO publishing.
- Stern, N. 2007, *The Economics of Climate Change*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press
- Stiglitz, J. Sen, A. And Fitoussi, J.P. 2010, *Mis-measuring our lives: why the GDP doesn't add up*. The New Press. New York,
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2012, *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future*. WW Norton.
- Thurok, N. 2012, *The universe within* Allen and Unwin. Based on the CBC Massy Lectures
- Treaty of Maastricht 1992. Article 5 on Subsidiarity.
- Ulrich, W. 1983, *Critical heuristics of social planning: a new approach to practical philosophy*. Wiley. New York.
- UNESCO, 2007, 'Biosphere Reserves: Dialogue in biosphere reserves'. References, Practices and Experiences. ISSN 2071-1468. Paris. UNESCO
- United Nations. 1993, *Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting: Handbook of National Accounting: Studies in Methods*, Series F. No 61, Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis, Statistical Division, United Nations, New York.
- United Nations Economic and Social Development Local Agenda 21 1992.
- United Nations Human Development Index 2003 A compact among nations to end poverty. UNDP. New York. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. 2011, *The Millennium Goals Report* <http://www.aidsdatahub.org/en/whats-new/287-all-data-alerts/728-the-millennium-development-goals-report-2011-united-nations-2011> Accessed July 19th, 2011.
- United Nations Climate Change Summit, 2009. The Copenhagen summit (2009) United Nations Climate Change Summit https://unfccc.int/meetings/copenhagen_dec_2009/meeting/6295.php
- United Nations Climate Change Summit, Cancun (2010) United Nations Climate Change Summit https://unfccc.int/meetings/cancun_nov_2010/meeting/6266.php
- United Nations Climate Change Summit, Durban (2011) United Nations Climate Change Summit https://unfccc.int/meetings/durban_nov_2011/meeting/6245.php
- Urry, J. 2007, *Mobilities*. Cambridge. Polity.
- Urry, J. 2010, 'Consuming the planet to excess'. *Theory, Culture and Society*. Vol. 27 191-212
- Van Gigch, J. 2003. *Metadecisions: rehabilitating epistemology*. Kluwer. Plenum.
- Vaske, J. and Kobrin, K. 2001, 'Place attachment and environmentally responsible behavior'. *Journal of Environmental Education*. Vol. 32, No. 4. Pp16-21.
- Vickers, G., 1983, *Human Systems are Different*, Harper and Row, London.
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. 2009, *The Spirit Level. Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London. Allen Lane
- Wynne, B. 1996. 'May the sheep safely graze? A reflexive view of the expert—lay knowledge divide' in Lash, S. Szerszynski and Wynne, B. *Risk, environment and modernity: towards a new ecology*. Sage. London.
- Young, I.M. 2000, *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Biography

McIntyre-Mills, J. is Associate Professor Flinders University, and Adjunct Professor University of Indonesia. Her publications address systemic representation, accountability and sustainability applied to social and environmental justice concerns. She addresses complex needs by exploring the meanings and 'what if' questions with diverse stakeholders.