BALANCING INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM: USER CENTRIC POLICY DESIGN TO ENHANCE EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT AND TO ADDRESS COMPLEX NEEDS

Janet McIntyre-Mills[1]
Janet.mcintyre@flinders.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Do we have a choice between isolation in zero sum competitive nation states or multilateralism?

I argue that based on an understanding of our common, intermeshed fate (Held et al 1999) that rational responses need to be systemic. This paper is exploratory. It considers the implications of ongoing research on the relevance of participation for testing out ideas for science, ethics, and democracy.

Testing enables the better match of development responses to context, thus enabling 'evolutionary development', rather than 'development for growth'. This is the difference between:

- **Development for growth** which is unsustainable, because it 'forgets' the 'externalities of poverty' and pollution and
- **Policy adaptation** (Giddens, 2009) that is based on responding to the environment by adapting and evolving designs that *are* socially, economically and environmentally sustainable.

INTRODUCTION

Greed has 'boomeranged' as pollution and poverty and selfishness has 'boomeranged' as war and conflict (Beck 1992, 1998, 1999 cited in McIntyre Mills, 2007 a, b, 2006 c, 2009 a, b).

The argument developed in this paper starts where Habermas ends in the '*Postnational Constellation*' (2001). Habermas argues that we can no longer limit democracy within the boundaries of a nation state. Giddens (2009) warns that localized efforts, whilst important for prefiguring change are insufficient to hold the market to account, unless they are applied regionally and internationally.

The challenge remains how do we work across conceptual boundaries (cultural, political and professional) and spatial boundaries (organisational, community, regional, international)?

Balancing Individualism

To this end we are working to develop a process of testing out ideas with those who are to be affected by the decision making process. This is based on the principle of subsidiarity and the Ashby's Rule/Principle (1956)[2].

The paper reflects on the relevance of participation for science, democracy and governance. It makes the case that participation in and of itself enables /enhances connections and a sense of wellbeing. It is the subject of ongoing testing in a range of contexts, because we believe it will make a difference to complex environmental challenges. This paper builds on arguments that have already been developed in previous papers on the topic (McIntyre-Mills 2008a and McIntyre-Mills et al 2008 b) referring to ongoing research into the relevance of user centric design.

The paper reflects on the research to develop a process and supportive software (which is a means to an end) and responds to some of these strategic challenges. The software design updates and learns as it is used by service users and providers (De Vries in McIntyre-Mills 2008a, McIntyre and de Vries 2008b).

Crowder[3] (2009) outlined three approaches to value pluralism in a lecture to colleagues at Flinders University entitled: "Three approaches to pluralism and its relevance for democracy". *The first approach* is agonistic, based on the idea that values are addressed through conflict. *The second* is culturalist, based on the argument that values are contextual. *The third* is liberal pluralism which accepts that diverse values co-exist and that they can be in conflict (such as equality and freedom), but that through dialogue and careful thinking a rational decision can be made. Crowder (2004) extends the work of Isaiah Berlin, a value pluralist. He stressed the importance of building bridges from a) a form of pluralism that supports individual freedom to b) pluralism that supports the common good. It is to this area of concern that the paper is addressed, based on past and current research funded by the Australian Research Council and Co-operative Research Centre for Aboriginal Health , respectively.

I argue that balancing individualism and collectivism requires ensuring that values can be diverse and people can be free to the extent that their values and freedoms do not undermine the diversity and freedoms of others. This requires personal rationality and public rationality. In this sense it is idealistic and normative, but it allows for the expanded testing out of ideas within context. To sum up: governance and democracy have to deal with three options pertaining to truth:
- One truth (monist) responses defended by grand narratives.
- No truth (postmodernist) approached defended by relativism or conflict.
- Mediated co-created responses based on testing out ideas with both professional experts and those with lived experience.

Scaling up value pluralism from local to regional requires the ability to be open to diversity, but also to find patterns. Co-creation at the local level is tested out at the local level by addressing the most complex and intractable problem. Complexity refers to the number, variety and interrelationships across variables and the way in which they are perceived or valued. The current way of doing politics is inadequate (Giddens 2009) and we will need to steer from above and below.

---

[2] Troncale, Len (2008) pers comm. argued that it is a principle, rather than a rule.
[3] Staff seminar held on 3 May, 2009. Flinders University.

Area of concern

We address the following concern. Is it possible to scale up mediated approaches based on co-creation? If so how? The Management Advisory Committee on Connecting Government in Australia gives examples and stresses the need for joined up governance to enable third way responses to patch up the ravages of contracting out and New Public Management, but how do we implement it?

Can we return to 'big government', because 'little government' is inadequate to deal with multilaterial concerns. Neither option is appropriate, so where to from here?

Balancing individualism and collectivism requires steering from above and below. We argue that marrying centralised controls and decentralised decision-making to support individual needs are not contradictory strategies[4]. It is appropriate to *combine* cycles of open discursive democracy with cycles of rational, structured dialogue supported by software (see Banathy 1996, 2000).

The former enables the generation of ideas and relationships in respectful conversation.

The latter enables better matches of service responses and greater attachment to rational, sustainable decisions through engagement with ideas and the implications for decisions.

This two-step process could be useful for mainstreaming social inclusion. It is important that both steps are maintained if we are to address the challenge to balance individual and collective needs. This requires multilevel governance to address complex challenges of social and environmental justice that span regions and nation states[5]. The argument can be summed up as follows:

Table 1: SEE -Social, Economic and Environmental implications of policy and practice

	Growth	Evolutionary /Matching
Social	National boundary focus using zero sum approach	Cosmopolitan approach decisions made at the lowest level possible but with the global covenant in mind supported by human rights that span frontiers (Nussbaum,2006)
Economic	Economic profit terms of reference exclude the externalities	Future oriented based on concern for the next generation of life This is where feed forward approaches are vital .The crashing of the markets is an opportunity to escape the 'iron cage of bureaucracy' (Beck 1999 : 147)
Environmental	Environment used to support profit	Earth politics (Beck 2005)

[4] Steering from above and below Why should we steer from below? Our research stresses that we need to achieve matching and to enhance capability to think reflexively and to enable individuals to address the rights of global citizens' (Beck 1999) against states where poverty and pollution are not being adequately addressed. Why should there be steering from above? We need a global covenant to be implemented global citizen's parliament (Held 2005: 308).

[5] The number of organisations – state, market and non government has proliferated. This has impacted on the 'intensity and extensity' of communication (Held, 1999, Beck, 2005) so that working with diverse values becomes increasingly important and increasingly challenging.

- Is testing out ideas through dialogue and the consideration of narratives important for evolutionary design and for the enhancement of consciousness?
- Can participation enhance attachment and improve our ability to make connections across ideas and to enhance consciousness?
- Can participatory democracy and governance provide a way to enhance steering from below and above?
- Can testing out ideas enable us to achieve greater mindfulness?
- Can steering from below and above be achieved?
- What other option do we have?

In large diverse democracies it makes sense to ensure that policies are guided by those who are to be affected by them. Consultation is inadequate. Ideas are lost en route, because of power differences and the ability of some to set the agenda at the expense of others. Steering (based on transdisciplinary research and communications research) enables on going e-democracy and e-governance. In small homogenous democracies voting and discursive policy setting was possible. Now in large heterogenous democracies this can be facilitated to enable ongoing matching of perceived needs and service outcomes. Steering from below, above and sideways requires management based on informatics pathways[6]. Rhodes (2000) draws on the literature on governance and defines his approach to governance as being in response to the impact of New Public Management and 'contracting out' approach under Thatcher and Reagan.

A network approach to governance is informed by policy networks (that are socially inclusive). The distinction is value based and it has implications for social and environmental sustainability (see McIntyre-Mills 2009 a, b). This is summed up by Kickert et al (1999), below:

---

[6] Networks are not necessarily democratic, but they can be governed by logic that finds root ideas and weights commonly selected options. This requires hierarchical sequencing.

Table 2: Locating the network approach

	NPM	Governance in policy networks	Systemic Governance for
Problem	Cost effectiveness	Interdependence	Energy and water shortages
Main orientation	Intra organisational	Interorganisational	Social and environmental sustainability
Main concern /Public Private dimension	Administrative control, business like	Facilitating co-governance/specific role for government	Carbon trading and negotiation across organisations and regions

Source: Adapted from New Public Management versus Governance in Policy Networks
Source: Kickert et al 1999:40 cited in McIntyre-Mills 2009 a,b)

McIntyre-Mills (2006, 2008) draws on these ideas and develops argument for testing out ideas with those who are to be affected by the decisions. With the caveat that diversity and freedom should be supported to the extent to which diversity and freedom are not undermined. We need to build capabilities to think conceptually and spatially or glocally at multiple levels and systemically. Our research builds on the field of critical, systemic thinking and practice by extending the concept of recursive consciousness This concept of mindfulness or 'recursive consciousness' was developed by Stafford Beer (1994:253) who cites Sir Geoffrey Vickers ' the trap is a function of the nature of the trapped'… their rationality is conditioned to the traps own premises'. Beer (1994) demonstrates that making connections impacts on all levels of the system from the individual to the community to the planet. We face the challenge of enabling people to think in terms of whole systems and to go beyond 'zero sum' competition and compartmentalized thinking at the state level if we are to develop what Beck (2005) calls ' cosmopolitan' or 'earth politics'. Being able to 'think about our thinking' through 'unfolding' values with those who are to be affected by our policy decisions and 'sweeping in' social, cultural, political, economic and environmental dimensions is vital (McIntyre-Mills 2006). West Churchman a philosopher and organizations researcher stressed this point, but so has the neuroscientist Professor, Baroness Greenfield[7], who stresses that making connections across many parts of the brain enhances mindfulness. Drawing on these influences I argue that governments are: on the one hand 'too big' to enable deliberation and discursive dialogue of diverse stakeholders to support individual wellbeing, but on the other hand,'too small' to address the common good of humanity and a fair share of the global commons.

We face the challenge of enabling people to think in terms of whole systems and to go beyond zero sum competition and compartmentalized thinking at the state level if we are to develop what Beck (1992, 2005) calls 'a cosmopolitan' or 'earth politics'. Systemic approaches will become more and more important in the future as we strive to develop 'evolutionary consciousness[8]', based on knowledge that is developed through making connections (Banathy, 2000). Theoretically the research is also underpinned by :
- Ulrich Beck's notion of sub politics of civil society that spans national boundaries to address risk and to develop a sense of 'earth politics'. He stresses (2005: 147)

---

[7] Aspects of the research will also be presented by McIntyre at the Asian Consciousness Conference in Hong Kong in June 2009.
[8] The root meaning of consciousness, according to Banathy (2000:388) is "knowing it all together'.

that 'the cage of modernity has opened up'. The 'iron cage of bureaucracy' theorized by Weber is no longer relevant for policy or management, because of the intermeshed nature of reality. But the risk is that the structures cannot deal with social, economic and environmental challenges. This has implications for legal systems and governments having to deal with droughts, rising temperatures, flooding , storm surges and fires.

- Anthony Giddens'(1984) concept of agency, in other words we can show agency to deal with structures that are not of our own choosing. This is called structuration theory.
- An adapted version of Jurgen Habermas' (2001) theory of ideal speech and communicative action based on testing out ideas with those who are affected. within and beyond the nation state as Habermas outlined in the 'postnational constellation'.
- Gould's notion (2007) of building transnational solidarity.
- Nussbaum's (2001) research on emotions, rationality and capabilities (1995, 2006), namely being able to think about our thinking. We need to build capabilities to think conceptually and spatially or glocally at multiple levels and systemically. These ideas have been informed by a range of thinkers ranging from Atkinson (2002) to Beck(1992,1998,2005)[9], Christakis and Bausch(2006) and Burns(2007) who argues that transcendence is through whole system change[10]. This requires 'joining up the dots' or 'thinking about our thinking' to create mindfulness.
- Dryzek (1999, 2000) work on discursive or deliberative democracy
- David Held's (1999, 2004, 2005) theory of social justice and his seven cosmopolitan principles.
- Greenfield (2000) who argues that the more connections[11] we can make, the more conscious and mindful we are and the more likely we are to make decisions that will

[9] See also Christakis and Bausch (2006) '*Wisdom of the people',* Stafford Beer (1994) 'Beyond dispute'.

[10] Burns work complements the work of Christakis and Bausch (2006) and McIntyre and De Varies (2008) which makes space for the recognition of evolving patterns of meaning based on the perceptions of users and providers and thus 'steering from above and below'. Pictures provide a 'highway to the unconscious'(Daum cited by Burns, 2007: 125) and a means to understand ourselves, our organizations and communities as well as how we relate to others. Why should we want to tap into the unconscious? Values, perceptions and emotions play a role in our thinking. The more we are able to 'think about our thinking', the more we are able to be mindful and aware of *why* we think the way we do. The systemic insights are important for policy and management decisions in our private and public lives. When we recognize emotions they can inspire more rational thought, provided we are able to think critically and systemically by 'unfolding' values , perceptions and emotions and 'sweeping in' the social, cultural, political, economic and environmental factors. Values, perceptions and emotions, were considered to undermine objectivity as far as enlightenment thinkers were concerned. Systemic thinkers across the social and natural sciences, for example from the human rights philosopher Nussbaum (2001,2006), psychologists (such as Brewer and Hewstone, 2004, Cornelius, 1996) to critical systemic thinkers such as Churchman (1982) ,Vickers (1983) , Wadsworth (2008a,b), systemic boundary researchers Midgely (2007) or neuroscientists such as Greenfield (2000). Burns provides a resource for all those who strive to work systemically at a personal, interpersonal, interorganisational and international, global level. Through examples the reader is drawn recursively to a deeper understanding of what it means to think and practice in a systemic manner. He argues that systemic action research enables the researcher and the researched to work together to co create new ways of addressing challenges. Through collaboration new ideas and practices emerge. Action research does not set itself up in opposition to quantitative surveys; it provides a way to use methods in complementary ways to achieve an understanding of an area of concern from the points of view of the many stakeholders. It stresses that systems are in the eyes of the beholders, but that the best fit response to an area of concern is based on triangulating the many views of stakeholders, consensus is not a requirement. Parallel views of diverse stakeholders are surfaced and their meanings and implications for policy and practice are explored.

[11] Consciousness is more than making neural connections. Although I take issue with Greenfield's construction of consciousness as 'a private life' of the brain, she does stress in many parts of her argument that *the neural connections made are a result of thinking about emotions* that are *responsive to the environmental stimuli.*

promote our wellbeing. The most important contribution is that she stresses that consciousness cannot be located anywhere; it is about connections (across many neurons and perceived variables) and the number of connections that enhances consciousness and our ability to think and appreciate out situations.

- Cornelius (1996) who summarizes and combines four lenses for understanding different dimensions of emotion[12], namely: 1)Darwinian Theory that stresses the similarity of emotions across people of all cultures. This continuum is supported by Greenfield's (2000) research into the neuroscience of consciousness The implications for social justice and for expanding notions of human rights are profound and have implications for cognitive capabilities, democracy, development and freedom (Nussbaum, 2006). 2)The social constructions of difference across self and other impact on wellbeing. 3) Jamesian theory that stresses that emotions are bodily reactions and that we can influence emotions through changing our behavior. 4) cognitive approaches are predated by philosophers such as Aristotle (see Cornelius 1996: 115) who stressed in Nichomachean ethics (see Irwin 1985) that wellbeing is supported by being involved or participating in public affairs (see McIntyre-Mills 2007). The importance of participation, social construction and valuing the experiences of those who are to be at the receiving end of decisions is important for wellbeing as I have stressed elsewhere (McIntyre-Mills 2008a-e)[13].

This research extends social cognition by drawing on the emotional knowledge and intuitive wisdom within stories and other forms of expression such as mapping and drawing. Transcendence is through whole system change which requires 'joining up the dots' or 'thinking about our thinking' to create mindfulness.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LOGIC AND RATIONALE FOR CURRENT SOFTWARE DESIGNTO ENHANCE DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE

My research journey was inspired (in part) by the work of the original thinker Donna Haraway (a feminist socialist) who stressed in ways that dovetail with Banathy (2000), a pluralist who argued for on evolutionary consciousness that we need to be the subjects not the objects of other people's designs:

> "There are several consequences to taking seriously the imagery of cyborgs as other than our enemies. Our bodies, ourselves; bodies are maps of power and identity….We can be

---

Conscious decisions to think about our emotions and to control our emotions leads us to be able to expand our consciousness. Mindfulness is the basis for wellbeing.

[12] Cornelius (1996: 184-219) argues different perspectives on emotions and values are not incommensurable and that by combining them into an integrated approach we can gain greater insight into all the dimensions of emotion. He uses the analogies of the blind man and the elephant arguing that if one can only appreciated a limited part of a phenomenon in a limited way then one's understanding will remain partial. He also uses the example of eating (1996: 211) and that it can be understood in terms of many dimensions. His analysis includes biology, psychology and social relations, but it could be expanded to include political and economic dimensions more explicitly.

[13] "But how does one attain deep, profound and lasting contentment? ….Although Aristotle mentions both wealth and political honour as candidates for eudaimonia. He denies that they are sufficient for eudaimonia. Rather, in order to become eudaimon, one must perfect the human function which, according to Aristotle is reasoning and thinking. Note that while practically all adults have reason and thought, few have perfected these abilities. According to Aristotle, it is only in the perfection of reasoning and thinking whereby a human being will achieve the profound happiness and contentment of which the human species is capable. Of course, many people disagree with Aristotle's view of the human good. Nevertheless his view that a human being is 'destined 'by nature to think, rather than to spend money or rule over others is a profound and provocative view of human nature…" (May in O Grady ed 2005: 154).

responsible for machines; they do not dominate or threaten us. We are responsible for boundaries; we are they." (Haraway, 1991).

The common good and value pluralism

To recap, values can be diverse to the extent that they do not undermine the diversity and freedoms of others, the environment or the next generation of life. Some goods are in conflict, for example individual freedom and equality within and across groups. Initially the concept of global commons was narrowly defined as "assets outside the national frontiers such as oceans, space and the Antarctic"[14]. This definition has been reframed to refer to the common good supported by social, legal, economic and environmental policy[15]. The Brundtland report *Our Common Future* (1987: 20) highlights the need to work across boundaries: [16] The global commons and quality of life provide the bases for wellbeing. Wellbeing' is defined in terms of Nussbaum and Glover's (1995) conditions for quality of life. The concept of 'Quality of life' draws on Nussbaum's notion of capability (1995: 83), which includes the importance of critical reflection:

> Being able to live to the end of a human life of normal length, not dying prematurely, or before one's life is so reduced as to be not worth living… Being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's own life. This includes…employment outside the home and to participate in political life…being able to show concern for other human beings…being able to live with concern for and in relation to animals, plants and the world of nature… Being able to laugh, to play, to enjoy recreational activities.

PROCESS FOR ENHANCING SOCIAL INCLUSION AND DECISION MAKING

How do we achieve this cultural shift away from unsustainable development designs to sustainable designs that are able to meet complex social, economic and environmental needs? An answer is through enhancing the capability of people to

---

[14] OECD definition http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/search.asp

[15] http://www.global-commons.org/display/CGC2/Home Welcome to the Coalition for the Global Commons"When referring to the global commons, people think mainly of ecological and climate issues, but the global commons involves most of our social and economic concerns as well. These include unemployment, loss of culture, hunger, water access, disease, migration, human rights abuses, biased information flows, lack of finance and aid, and mounting debt - all relationships that impact our lives across national borders. On March 5, 2008, the Coalition for the Global Commons launched an **international consultation process** that engages partners across the world in the development of a common global action plan. The Coalition for the Global Commons seeks to provide a multilateral platform in politics, economics, civil society, science, religious communities, academia, and the media that will enable leaders, experts and the public across the world to work together for a new system of global economic and political cooperation. Our consultation activities include personal discussions and 'town-hall' meetings, advanced electronic methods for obtaining group agreement from distinct opinions, and this moderated Wiki website. The results of these consultations will be made public at a conference of international stakeholders in 2010, Convention on the Global Commons, where consensus on an action plan will be completed".

[16] http://www.worldinbalance.net/agreements/1987-brundtland.html

understand that 'zero sum' survival politics is not in the long term interests of nation states, because we are dependant on 'one world'(Singer, 2002)[17] .

The concepts employed in the research are 'networks for systemic governance and accountability[18] 'based on considering 'if then' scenarios to build a sense of the implications for self, others and the environment. (Practical strategic choices for democracy and governance policy (adapted from Kjaer, 2004 include:

a) Isolationism - Nationalist realist stances based on the notion of separate interests and separate world views- competition and conflict prevail.

b) Multilateralism based on diverse pluralist ideas based on bargaining despite differences. This requires communication across conceptual and spatial boundaries and it requires capability to think critically and analytically and to engage in dialogue. It could support multilateralism based on federalist regions spanning national boundaries based on commensurable shared commons, informed by subsidiarity and the notion of Ashby's Rule/Principle of Requisite Variety and an understanding of our common fate as 'one world'. The software was designed to address wellbeing. It addresses what people perceive that they 'have in their lives' and what they perceive that they need to add to their lives. They also consider what they are going to do to achieve the things that they value and what they will give up, in order to achieve their needs. Services and actions to address each of their needs are also addressed by means of the software. Turning points for the better and worse are considered, based on their values and emotions. Barriers are considered last of all, so that the users are encouraged to think creatively and positively about their future. The users could be citizens who already have the vote, but it could also be used to extend participation to non voters. The software appeals to some of the most marginalised in society, namely young people who will have to live with the results of our decisions in the future and Aboriginal service users who commented that it can be empowering to sit alongside a carer and to take actions and make sense of multiple challenges through working through difficulties and exploring options that are documented each time the software is used.

A criticism that has been posed is that the software is potentially very powerful:
• Arguments from the left are that it could enhance more participatory and direct forms of governance and democracy.
• Arguments from the right are that it could be used by governments to replace staff members or for surveillance from above. The software was designed to support social and environmental justice and it is free ware. It is meant to enhance case work and accountability to service users by improving the match and combination of services in context.

---

[17] We are all part of the same earth. So "us versus them" at a local, national and international level is unsustainable in the long term. Transnational solidarity networks (Gould, 2007) will need to help ensure that the state –market interests do not continue to prevail. Balancing individualism and collective interests requires steering from above and below. But how can this be achieved?

The implications for the way in which we live our personal and public lives is profound. Testing out ideas through dialogue and the consideration of narratives is important for evolutionary design and for the enhancement of consciousness. Competition for scarce resources has implications for peace within and across nation states, but also intergenerational consequences. Competition, in particular for the last of the non-renewables, oil and uranium underpins international relations.

[18] McIntyre-Mills 2006, 2008) develops argument for testing out ideas with those who are to be affected by the decisions and develops an argument for participation, with the caveat that diversity and freedom should be supported to the extent to which diversity and freedom are not undermined.

The software aims to work with perceptions and values to enhance the ability of people to steer from below. Their choices are registered at the local level, not just on 'butcher's paper' or in a summary report. Even more importantly the choices are made on the basis of considering if-then scenarios. What if I do this, or that, what are the implications for my life? In the extended software we will consider the implications for others and the environment. From the point of view of the users it can be used to enhance service delivery, build evidence based policy by mapping what works why and how. But it has another important dimension and that is enabling people to think critically and systemically about the implications of policy choices. If citizens are able to steer from below within and across national boundaries using free software, it could help to redress the current imbalances.

Currently the world faces social, economic and environmental challenges that are unprecedented. Arguably many of the current risks have been created by decisions that have not taken into account the full costs of economic decisions. Risks to health have been caused by: a) intensive farming methods that have lead to Avian, swine and bovine diseases that infect human beings. b) unsustainable industrial expansion built on fossil fuels c) zero sum competition across nation states for the last of the non renewables.

Mindfulness and an expanded form of democracy

Balancing individualism and collectivism requires the capability to think through 'if-then' scenarios so as to develop an understanding of shared concerns about rationality and the extent to which democracy is failing[19] (Participation based on narratives and the use of 'soft systems maps'(Checkland and Scholes,1990) or 'picturing' enables not merely ownership of ideas, but enables complex variables relationships to be described and the relationships across the variables can be explained and mapped out by service users. Rhodes argues that governance needs to restore social and state responsibility to counterbalance the market or to shape the market to address social and environmental concerns (Rhodes 2000 in Pierre 2000: 54). Held et al (1999: 114) argue that the EU provides a federalist approach to decision making which could be worth considering more widely as a means to protect the commons regionally. The notion of being able to vote within a region where one lives and works (Maastricht Treaty) could be applied to regions of the planet, not just EU. Taxes could be paid to regional banks and these regional banks could allocate funds to those in the greatest need and at risk of the worst impacts of climate change.

Can mindfulness be enhanced from above and below through participation?

As the world becomes hotter and natural disasters increase, the challenge for survival will become greater. We need to think locally, regionally and globally and develop multilevel democracy for multilevel governance. What matters is that people feel engaged and respected and that their ideas are listened to. Representation[20] is one of the

---

[19] Thus addressing the concerns raised by Gore (2007) in 'Assault on Reason' and concerns by Rosenberg (2002) that citizens are not always rational).

[20] Representation in diverse democracies needs to be based on engagement, not just voting. Legal measures that make respectful dialogue across diverse stakeholders institutionalized in constitutions the world over. The idea is not to ensure that the process supports sibsidiarity, namely those at the receiving end of a decision should be party to the

major challenges if democracy is to be enhanced and if people are to be able to understand the consequences of their decisions – a cultural shift[21] that is needed to develop more sustainable futures. Through the process of engaging in dialogue ideas need to be explored by asking: Who said this, why and in what context? How do their ideas overlap or diverge from others? Democracy can be kept in check through testing out ideas and ensuring that those in power do not control what constitutes truth. *Consciousness* is defined as 'making connections' and it is adapted[22] from the work of Nussbaum(2001)[23], Cornelius(1996)[24] and Greenfield(200:13, 21) stresses that emotions are the key to understanding consciousness and our thinking. Nevertheless it is possible

---

decision making process, thereby ensuring that complex decisions can be made that represent the needs of the majority whilst taking into account the needs of the minority whose ideas could be vital for problem solving. Sustainability need to be institutionalized. By engaging in processes that enhance participatory democracy we can match decisions more appropriately and enable people to have ownership of the ideas. Economics plays a role if the contracts made with governments are governed by these aspects.

[21] See Goff, S for a discussion on 'cultural shift' at Action Learning and Action Research Association Inc. see Goff,S, 2007 *Participatory Practices: on being our field together* ALAR Journal volume 12 No 2 : 106-126

[22] As discussed in McIntyre-Mills 2008 "User centric design to meet complex needs", her work stresses that the brain is plastic and responsive to the environment. The title of her book "The private life of the brain" is unfortunate, because the brain is not private and it is the shaper and shaped by the world (Aleksander 2005. A better title would be: "The private and public life of the brain" as it would better suit her argument (as I have read it). Consciousness is not located in any one place according to her. It is also greater than the sum of the parts in the brain and the chemical connections and the social, historical and environmental stimuli, nevertheless the parts are important. Therefore it is possible as Cornelius (1996) suggests to integrate neurophysiological, Darwinian evolutionary theory about the similarities of all human beings, but also that all life is connected. Consciousness is a continuum, the more we can think about our thinking the more conscious we become (McIntyre-Mills Ed. 2006). Bodily aspects of thinking are important as Greenfield has suggested, but she also recognizes that communication feedback loops, to which we are exposed in our society, play a vital role as well to changing our consciousness. The more connections we make the more aware we become. The brain is able to make connections through experiential learning. The mind is not located in any one place it is the connections we make. Consciousness is a continuum, we can be more or less conscious depending on the number of connections made. So mindfulness is based on thinking about our thinking. Critical self awareness is essential for decision making and governance that supports wellbeing. The key to raising consciousness and self awareness is through greater understanding of the way that emotions cloud our thinking and limited our ability to make connections. The more we are able to understand the perceptions of others, the more connections we can make and the more conscious we become. Aboriginal understandings of wellbeing emphasize that wellbeing is about a sense of connection across self-other and the environment. Sharp (2005) has developed a powerful argument about consciousness and our connection to living creatures other than ourselves if we are prepared to accept that being gives rights. She argues that consciousness does not have to enable rational speech, just being.

[23] "Emotions shape the landscape of our mental and social lives. Like geological upheavals in the landscape, they mark our lives as uneven, uncertain, and prone to reversal. Are they simply, as some have claimed, animal energies or impulses with no connection to our thoughts? Or are they suffused with intelligence and discernment, and thus a source of deep awareness and understanding? "If the latter then emotions cannot be sidelined in accounts of ethical judgement as they often have been…. (Nussbaum, 2001, prologue).

"Indeed the great advantage of a cognitive/evaluative view of emotion is that it shows us where societies and individual have the freedom to make improvements. If we recognize the element of evaluation the emotions, we also see that they can themselves be evaluated – and in some ways altered, if they fail to survive criticism. Social constructions of emotion are transmitted through parental cues, actions and instructions long before the larger society shapes the child…." (Nussbaum, 2001:173).

[24] *Emotions* are defined systemically by Cornelius (1996) who summarizes and combines four lenses for understanding different dimensions of emotion, namely: Darwinian theory that stresses the similarity of emotions across people of all cultures. This continuum is supported by Greenfield's (2000) research into the neuroscience of consciousness The implications for social justice and for expanding notions of human rights are profound and have implications for cognitive capabilities, democracy, development and freedom (Nussbaum, 2006). The social constructions of difference across self and other impact on wellbeing. Jamesian theory that stresses that emotions are bodily reactions and that we can influence emotions through changing our behavior.

to think about the way our lives and life chances have been constructed (as a result of our culture and where we live and the level of education and income of our parents and whether or not they were given the vote). Our sense of control over our lives or sense of agency will be shaped by our experiences and emotions and the experiences and emotions of our family and friends, nevertheless we have the capacity to think about our situation and our emotions and to make connections across why our lives are the way they are.

The paper stresses that the work of Paul MacLean cited by Arthur Koesler in his work *'the Ghost in the Machine'* (1978) needs to be regarded with caution because the notion of a brain that functions in terms of separate parts is outdated. Consciousness based on thinking about our thinking and making connections enables us to become more aware of the implications of our choices. Biologically we are not destined to behave in the ways dictated by our limbic reptilian base brain , inherited from our past stage of development , on which is built in successive layers a lower mammalian and higher mammalian brain. We are capable of thinking about the implications of our choices if we can avoid zero sum arguments that encourage us to think in terms of us and them.

W can override base instincts. We have the ability to make choices. As stressed in McIntyre-Mills (2008a, McIntyre-Mills et al, 2008c, McIntyre-Mills 2008d, e) Greenfield (2000: 21) argues that emotions and feelings are the most basic aspects of consciousness. She calls them 'the building blocks' and that when we temper our emotions through thinking through implications of acting out passions we are able to become more mindful or conscious.

> "Emotions are with us all the time, to a greater or lesser degree…I shall be arguing that you cannot understand consciousness without understanding emotion, and that consciousness is not purely rational or cognitive, as some particularly those working in artificial, computational systems have implied. .." (op cit).

Drawing on and extending Cornelius (1996) it can be argued that emotion can be better understood from a systemic viewpoint that draws on many (not incommensurate theories of emotion). Awareness within context and responsive appraisal of many dimensions means that connections and interactions are the basis for human wellbeing. The brain can think in hierarchies and divisions, but it can also think in terms of connections and continuums or in parallel[25] and the ability to see connections and to accept parallels enables us to be creative and more conscious. It is this dimension that is important for spiritual life and an area of interest to many Aboriginal informants on what constitutes wellbeing. Indigenous cultures the world over have stressed the importance of

---

[25] "The brain has an amazing capacity to process information in parallel, a function not well seen in present computers. A mother trying to get her children ready for school is a good example, as she is managing different requests simultaneously. Further, it (was) argued by physicist Donald Mackay, on logical grounds, that even if we knew all the neural events and their external causation, we could still not predict what decision a person would make. We are not just automatons. Second, through our consciousness we can reflect on the sensory experiences we have had, and there is continuity from one day to the next. We wake up and realize we are in the same bedroom we were in before we went to sleep, and we remember we are the same person. All our stored memories make us who we are. Finally our feelings, those of love, hate, pride, loyalty, for example, cannot easily be explained as simply the workings of electrical current and chemistry in the brain. In fact it is impossible to prove they are merely electrical currents…Mackay considered that brain and soul together form a unity, complementary, and linked to our cerebral processes. Therefore we have a realistic basis for studying the brain as a machine, but without rejecting the moral and spiritual significance of human nature" Clarke, G. 2007. Extract from Boyer Lectures *The Weekend Australian*, Inquirer, November 10-11. Creator of the first bionic ear.

connection with the land (McIntyre-Mills et al, 2003, 2006c) and with animals (Sharpe 2005) because our wellbeing is determined by 'the sacred web of life'(Capra, 1996) of which we are part.

We are not locked into a zero sum game

Sir Nicholas Stern (2008)[26] stresses that in 2009 we must sign up to a Global Treaty to agree that each nation should cut of all green house gas emissions by around 50% by 2050. This will require education of people at the local level. Seattle is one of the cities that Giddens (2009) highlights as a climate change leader. Many people in Seattle do not understand the science of climate change but they do have an understanding of the need to address energy challenges. (Giddens, 2009: 102) [27]. Participation in local citizen parliaments and engaging in education programs will be important so that people can understand the implications of their choices and realize that we will all be losers as we are all in the same boat.

Dawkins (1996, 2006) argues in 'the selfish gene' and in the 'god delusion', respectively that we are programmed to think about ourselves and not others and that we have used religion to delude ourselves. In McIntyre-Mills (2009a, b) I argue that if we apply CST to his argument and apply the 5 knowledge domains of West Churchman's (1979) the Design of Inquiring Systems Approach (DIS) outlined in 'The Systems Approach', which suggests thinking about our thinking based on questioning whether we have considered our arguments in terms of the 5 knowledge domains his work can be critiqued as follows:

Table 3: An Application of West Churchman's Five Knowledge Domains to escape the zero sum game (see McIntyre-Mills 2009b[28] forthcoming)

Logic	Connections across the premises leading to a conclusion	He polarizes deist versus non deist approaches to God. He admits that Einstein does not anthropomorphise god – instead Einstein sees god as universal energy, whilst Capra (1996) sees the web of life as sacred. Dawkins stresses that atheism is the only rational approach .But why polarize god into deist versus non deist options? People need to use the kinds of metaphors that suit their level of education or understanding. It is a continuum of beliefs. So his argument is illogical
Empiricism	Research based on qualitative and quantitative data	Dawkins is a biologist – he argues that we are only good at short range and medium range thinking. He is unaware of the work of Greenfield on consciousness and the way that we can make

choices and connections by thinking about our thinking.

Idealism	Treating people as ends in themselves, not means to an end	Human rights and environmental sustainability are only possible when boundaries can be drawn, but unless people are part of the decision making process it can be regarded as problematic for democracy across boundaries.
Dialectic	Based on exploring ideas	The process of engaging in dialogue can help to create connections, enhance a sense of connection to ideas and increase understanding.
Expanded pragmatism	Considering the consequences for this generation and the next	Testing by people who are to be affected and with the next generation in mind

In terms of the 'so what' question it is hopeful, because it means that we are not bound by biology to a hopeless future. Consciousness based on thinking about our thinking and making connections enables us to become more aware of the implications of our choices. This requires ongoing involvement in thinking about social, political and economic options. We need to take participation to the class rooms and local governments so that participation in politics becomes part of daily life. Csikszentmihalyi[29] stressed the importance of being involved in creating; he calls this effortless state or 'flow'. It is important for creating happiness, according to Nussbaum and Aristotle and it is supported by our research as well as the work of National Economics (2002, 2003) and the work of Putnam (1995). People need to have experience of participating from an early age and they need to feel that their ideas are being listened to.

A WAY FORWARD AND A PROPOSAL

I will d**emonstrate** the process and the prototype software developed with De Vries and members of the ARC team. The second stage of the research is funded by the CRCAH. The research teams spans policy, public health, informatics and cultural studies. This section details the next stage of our research.

Professor Paul Hoggett, based at the Centre for Psycho –Social Studies at University of the West of England is organizing 'Facing Climate Change' an interdisciplinary conference on climate denial has stressed that climate change needs to be addressed in terms of psycho –social dimensions:

"We will examine denial from a variety of different perspectives: as the product of addiction to consumption, as the outcome of the diffusion of responsibility and the idea that someone else will sort it out, and as the consequence of living in a perverse culture [that] encourages collusion, complacency [and] irresponsibility'.[30]

Critical Systemic Thinking and Practice approaches help managers and policy makers to hold in mind multiple variables and to consider areas of concern in terms of:
 • Praxis to support public policy and management needs to hold in mind multiple variables and consider :

---

[29] http://www.ted.com/index.php/talks/mihaly_csikszentmihalyi_on_flow.html
[30] Naish, J 2009 'Climate denial is a mental disorder'. Australian, 7-8, 28.

- Relationships across the sectors (public, private and third sector) and the way they play out across the state, market and society
- Range of disciplines
- Subjective, objective and intersubjective domains of knowledge
- Paradoxes and implications for policy and practice through –
  - Complementary theory and methods
  - Testing ideas to ascertain if policy decisions are sustainable for this generation and the next
  - Dialogue, making decisions based on careful contextual considerations and taking into account the norms, values and rules, but also
  - Show agency in making new paradigms, learning by doing, developing pilot approaches and leadership in rule making. (See McIntyre-Mills 2004, 2006a, c).

Flinders University is in the process of developing research in partnership with Local Government to research ways to enhance decision making and policy using a computer-aided model. This research will build on previous research that used a computer-aided model to develop sound policy to improve the wellbeing of disadvantaged people within the community. There is also an opportunity to internationalise the project through involvement with the University of Indonesia. The impacts of climate change and possible actions to minimize the impacts present a complex problem to communities and governments around the world. Broadly, the research will use a computer-aided information-gathering process which is designed to get both facts and perceptions from members of the community ('users') and the local government community (service providers'). The aim of the research is to develop climate change policy and actions, using a participatory process with the 'users' and 'service providers'. The research will focus on perceptions of:

- What will work (and, conversely, what <u>will not</u> work);
- Why it will work; and
- How it will work.

In developing the computer-aided model the participatory process will identify:

- Key concepts relating to climate change;
- The decision making context;
- Constraints to achieving outcomes;
- Elements of three scenarios (denial of the need to change, too little action too late, sustainable long term adjustments); and
- Key factors (variables) in tackling the issue of climate change.

The computer-aided model provides:

- a framework for gathering data and perceptions;
- an unbiased repository of facts and perceptions from 'users' and 'service providers';
- the ability to detect patterns and relationships from the facts and perceptions – a key element in understanding the complexity of the issue;

- a web-based tool that can be accessed by all local governments and their communities to assist in decision-making; and
- A tool that 'learns' (updates and grows) as more communities use it.

This research on e-democracy and e-governance policy, process ICT and software prototype will be tested at participating local government organisations in Australia in the first instance to ascertain if participation in an interactive website would a) help to extend democracy, b) enhance governance accountability c) achieve seamless service delivery based on pattern recognition d) narrow the gap between performance outcomes and their perceived needs. e) help to build evidence based policy and f) more effectively manage risk. Our existing prototype is the basis for developing interactive e-democracy and e-governance interface that will be tested using different ICTs (computer, mobile phones) for mapping interrelated factors that support livability and wellbeing.

Research hypothesis
- The greater the use of 'if then' scenarios for decision making, the more sustainable the policy decisions.
- The greater the use of dialogue to discuss 'if then' scenarios the greater the level of understanding of policy implications.

Exploratory questions
1. Can participatory dialogue (and conceptual tools and software) enhance representation and accountability?
2. What knowledge maps do service providers and service users have in relation to ways to address wellbeing, livability and the size of our carbon footprint?
3. How does location (hills, plains, coastal areas) impact on decisions to reduce size of carbon footprint? Are people in high risk areas more likely to make greater changes than those in low risk areas?

The *research design* a) surveys perceptions of service users and providers before and after the participants use the e-governance/e-democracy prototype b) addresses discursive perceptions of the way informants understand experiences based on narratives and soft systems maps (including cultural maps and organizational maps) of what works why, how and to what effect using systemic action research. c) Undertakes iterative workshops across interest groups to map areas of convergence and divergence (Delphi technique) and the construction of a computing model that addresses both the perceptions of users and providers on what works, why, how and to what effect and d) Develops a computer model through participatory action research and action learning. Menus of options will be presented in diagrammatic /pictorial form to show the connections across needs and service available e) What success and failure look like for service users f) identify gaps in services and g) hold organizations to account.

Methodology

Critical Systemic Action Research enables the researcher and the researched to work together to co-create new ways of addressing challenges (Burns, 2007). Through collaboration new ideas and practices emerge. Action research does not set itself up in opposition to quantitative surveys; it provides a way to use methods in complementary ways to understand the views of many stakeholders. Parallel views of diverse stakeholders are surfaced and their meanings and implications for policy and practice are

explored. In focus groups with the users and providers we will ask exploratory questions about 'closeness of fit' or 'match' operationalised by: a) Temporal/currency of services b) Interdependence of services/needs c) Context of services and need d) Inter relatedness. The qualitative data will be collected by means of a systemic, transdisiciplinary approach combining documentary analysis, interviews and soft systems mapping of the relationships across the variables. These data will be analyzed to find patterns and taxonomies and the current prototype will be adapted and tested in both the Australian and Indonesian local government locations.

The prototype built on a generic computing algorithm for handing multivariate and multidimensional resource allocations and has been adapted to enable an analysis of questions regarding the extent to which matrix trans organizational management can meet complex needs (De Vries, 2008). The prototype needs to be extended so that it can be used across multiple ICTs and tested to establish its ability to update as it is used by diverse service users and providers. We will use the Delphi technique of iterative focus groups to establish the initial perceptions and once we have achieved saturation point on issues we will enable the service users and service providers to use the software and add to the data base as co-researchers. They will help the programmer to develop the software that will enable greater representation and accountability across service organizations, sectors and disciplinary areas. The service users tell stories that are the basis for participatory design to help manage complex decision-making and to provide critical insights into social, cultural, political, economic and environmental factors that are perceived to support and undermine wellbeing. These are mapped and analyzed using Nvivo.

Research stages

The First Phase of this critical systemic research is to collect data from participants to add to the prototype from focus group discussions across councils in the Hills, Plains and Coastal areas based on conversations and mapping out their ideas using soft systems approaches (refs) and to analyze the patterns in the data using Nvivo to generate the informatics design. We will analyze the patterns using Nvivo to generate the patterns for informatics design that models a conversation based on scenarios about future wellbeing. We will develop sample screens for discussion with the participants

The Second Phase of the research will be to test the software prototype with participants via a 'sandpit' version of an interactive website with mobile links to partner organizations. The software updates and grows as it is used and it enables choices to be made on the basis of conditional scenarios. The design builds on the following questions adapted from De Vries (2008:373-404):

"What social/economic/environmental factors help/hinder wellbeing? What five factors are most important for your wellbeing? What five factors are most detrimental? How does each factor help or hinder other aspects of life? How important is the factor on this 5 point scale? If I solve this problem or have this asset first, does it make solving other problems easier? Do these things always happen together? Or one after another? How do I achieve it? How do I avoid it? Where can I get help for it? Who can I help and how, if they need this or have this problem? Is it sometimes good and sometimes bad – in what situations? Are there other names/terms for the same thing? What can stop me from (or make it really hard) getting/achieving it? What conditions

do I have to achieve to get it? Is this a smaller or larger part of another issue? If one thing happens, does another thing usually follow? List good and bad things". The significance of the approach is that it will ascertain a) if it is possible to achieve a sense of solidarity with others through this form of engagement and b) if the approach helps to achieve audits in a workable manner that can be extended locally and regionally.

The prototype software models a conversation based on scenarios about future wellbeing. The factors that are perceived important for wellbeing and will be explored participants from three local government areas in South Australia spanning high, medium and low income areas. The software encourages telling one's own unique narrative and then comparing it with typical narratives that act as portals for exploring options in one's own life. It enables the marginalised service users to ask only once, and to register whether their needs are being met. This develops cognitive pathways and connections (Greenfield 2002) and thus enhances their ability to 'think about their thinking 'as a starting point for lobbying and making changes in their lives.

By the end of *Third Phase* we will have ascertained whether the process and prototype for e-governance and e-democracy helps to enhance social inclusion and social justice and whether the organizations could be held to account. These findings will be shared with all the local participants and then we will have a series of e-live conversations with participants in Indonesia. These conversations will be the precursors to the Fourth Phase of the research in Indonesia.

In Australia our focus is the integration of services to operationalise triple bottom line accounting and accountability. The South Australian Local Government Association together with participating councils in South Australia located in Hills, Plains and Coastal areas will enable us to work with participants within their council areas.

McIntyre is Adjunct professor at the University of Indonesia with the task of helping to enhance research on representation, accountability and sustainability. The Cimahi Council, together with the Bandung_ Trust and Bandung Institute of Technology have demonstrated their ability to implement e-governance systems and a commitment to extending representation and accountability. The Wahid Institute where McIntyre delivered a lecture on e-governance and e-democracy has stressed its interest in this approach on its website (http://www.wahidinstitute.org/english/content/view/12/40/). The potential to develop regional relationships at the local level is an attractive aspect of the project. The challenge for democracy is to ensure that we act not only for the current generation but also for future generations, thus the caretaking role is important and can be facilitated by this process. We anticipate that the outcome of our research will be to enable participating councils to apply a customized decision making tool that will enable them to work with a range of stakeholders in a range of locations so as to enable them to make decisions that will support service delivery that responds to rising temperatures, manages building codes, manages risk in hills and coastal areas and manages water use and alternative energy options in their council areas. The research will enable residents to think through what services they would like to select and the implications in terms of costs (social, economic and environmental) through an interactive service with mobile phone links. Our decision making software could support evidence based policy on climate change that can operationalise triple bottom line accounting and accountability. The research builds on a successful design for a prototype to narrow the gap between needs and outcomes to address the following concerns: a) Identification of real world

(hard systems) and perceived (soft systems) problems in the network of service provision and address social , economic and environmental factors in hills, plains and coastal areas.

The challenge for democracy is to ensure that we act not only for the current generation but also for future generations, thus the caretaking role is important and can be facilitated by this process.

We anticipate that the outcome of our research could enable participating councils to apply a customized decision making tool that could enable them to work with a range of stakeholders in a range of locations so as to enable them to make decisions that could support service delivery that responds to rising temperatures, manage building codes, manages risk in hills and coastal areas and manages water use and alternative energy options in their council areas. The research could enable residents to think through what services they would like to select and the implications in terms of costs (social, economic and environmental) through an interactive service with mobile phone links. Our decision making software could support evidence based policy on climate change that can operationalise triple bottom line accounting and accountability. We could build on a successful design for a prototype to narrow the gap between needs and outcomes to address the following concerns: a) Identification of real world (hard systems) and perceived (soft systems) problems in the network of service provision and address social , economic and environmental factors in hills, plains and coastal areas.

EVOLUTIONARY DESIGN PARTICIPATION TO ADDRESS COMPLEX NEEDS

Let me end by talking about life chances. In a village in a small skiing village in Austria, such as Saalbach the locals and visitors leave their skis outside when they go for après ski drinks. They collect a newspaper on the way home, skis over their shoulders and pop a coin into the plastic box attached to a lamp pole. No one is concerned about people stealing newspapers or skis because everyone has more or less the same life chances. Besides the community is small and no one would consider it worthwhile to take the risk of stealing a small item like a newspaper or a large item like skis. In developing countries children make a living selling newspapers on the street. I wonder what the ski villages will be like in a few decades time, with little snow in winter and increased erosion caused by mudslides? Certainly the life chances of many will become less privileged without resources. Wellbeing may already be too much to expect, but even livability requires maintaining 'the web of life' (Capra, 1996) Climate change will mean that the concerns of the marginalized will in all likelihood become the concerns of the privileged sooner than we think (Fiona Stanley, Hawke Oration, 2009). 'Earth politics' is the term coined by Beck (1999, 2005) and it is to this concept that I wish to turn. How can we shift from user centric narrow pragmatism to user centric expanded pragmatism, based on choices informed by an understanding of systemic feed back and feed forward loops? Multidimensional and multispatial design is what is needed for a just and sustainable world. We need to be able to do dialogue for policy and practice in such a way that we take into account time (past, present and future) and place (our own, our neighbours and that of children and their children's) (See McIntyre-Mills 2006 a, c).The nation state is responsible to its citizens, but who is responsible for ensuring the fabric of life is maintained? Nation states need to be aware that zero sum logic is flawed.

CONCLUSION

To sum up the paper

- **Builds** on arguments that have already been developed in previous papers on the topic (McIntyre-Mills 2006c, 2007, a-c, 2008a-e) and refers to ongoing research into the relevance of participation to enhance critical systemic thinking and practice. We need to prevent the creation of zombie institutions 'the walking dead', because they are not responsive to the environment they are supposed to serve (Beck 2005). Governance responses have been limited to 'war on terror', or 'war on economic collapse', without developing the means to achieve systemic intervention across social, economic *and* environmental concerns with future generations in mind.

- **Argues** that discursive democracy within and across nation states is important for testing out ideas and improving the sustainability match across human beings, their policy choices and their environment. Action learning and participatory action research supports expanded testing of ideas for development, not only by 'the experts' but by people with lived experience.

- **Makes the case** that testing is constructive, because it a) enhances participant's sense of attachment to ideas through co-creating ideas with others and thus b) makes connections – bonds and bridges with others (Putnam, 1995, McIntyre-Mills 2006c). It explores the implications of decisions. This can be vital for balancing individualism and collectivism, because it enables people to think about self-others- environment including the next generation of life. Thinking about our thinking develops a greater number of connections across different parts of our brain the neurons that is consciousness.

Discusses the challenges of extending democracy and governance by considering the implications of steering from above and below for a) evidence based policy and b) matching services to needs and c) its potential for scaling *up* social, economic and environmental wellbeing.

We face social, economic and environmental challenges that are unprecedented.[31] but the global economic meltdown needs to be used as an opportunity to change direction. Open democracy is still the best hope we have, but only if it enables sustainable futures.

REFERENCES

Ashby, W.R., 1956*, An introduction to Cybernetics*, Chapman and Hall, London.
Atkinson, J.2002. Trauma Trails. Recreating song lines. Spinefex Press.

---

[31] Those who point this out are no longer speaking from the margins; they include Barack Obama and Gordon Brown and Sir Nicholas Stern. The establishment is looking a little different from the way it used to look. It includes an American president whose identity spans a heritage that is both African and American. He lived in Indonesia attended a Catholic school Assisi. Gordon Brown is a social democrat whose financial leadership will be tested to establish whether government can help us achieve a cultural shift that will place the environment as principal, the government and the people will need to be caretakers. This shift is away from the primacy of society not in the sense used by the quote of Thatcher but in the sense that we will need to act for the environment (Beck, 1999, 2005). The role of civil society based on a social contract for the powerful and the able will need to be re-worked to take into account the needs of the silenced (sentient beings and the needs of young children who will inherit the risks of toxic air and the principle of subsidiarity can only be applied if people can engage in dialogue and see the way that their ideas are mapped and modeled to achieve their own outcomes. We cannot take with us Universalist assumptions of the answers other than a belief in the need for a sustainable future for all in this generation and the next. At best we can make democratic decisions that are informed by as many of the affected as possible.

Banathy, B. 1996 *Designing social systems in a changing world*. Plenum.London.

Banathy, B. 2000.*Guided evolution of society: a systems view*, Kluwer/Plenum, London.

Bateson, G., 1972, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man's Understanding of Himself,* Ballantine, New York.

Beck, U 1992 *Risk Society Towards a New Modernity*, Sage. London

Beck, U 1999 *World Risk Society*. Polity. Cambridge.

Beck, U. 1998 *Democracy without Enemies*, Polity. Cambridge.

Beck, U. 2005 *World Risk Society* Polity. Cambridge.

Beer, S., 1994, *Beyond Dispute. The Invention of Team Syntegrity,* Wiley. New York.

Beer, S., 1994, Beyond Dispute. The Invention of Team Syntegrity, Wiley. New York.

Brewer, M and Hewstone, M. eds 2004 *Social cognition* Blackwell. Oxford.

Brundtland, G. http://www.worldinbalance.net/agreements/1987-brundtland.html The report "Our Common Future"

Burns, D. 2007. Systemic Action Research: A strategy for whole system change. Policy Press. University of Bristol.

Capra, F. 1996 *The web of life: A new synthesis of mind and matter,* Harper Collins

Checkland, P. and Scholes, J., 1990, Soft Systems Methodology in Action, Wiley, Chichester.

Checkland, P. and Scholes, J., 1990, *Soft Systems Methodology in Action*, Wiley, Chichester.

Christakis, A. 2004, Wisdom of the People *Systems Research and Behavioural Science* Volume 21 No 5 479-488.

Christakis, A. and Bausch, K. 2006, *How People Harness their Collective Wisdom and Power to Construct the Future in Co-laboratories of democracy*, Information Age. Greenwich.

Christakis, A. and Brahms, S., 2003, "Boundary spanning dialogue for the 21st century agoras", *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*. 20:371-382.

Churchman, C.West 1979 *The Systems Approach and its Enemies,* Basic Books, New York.

Churchman, C.West. 1982. *Thought and Wisdom*, Intersystems Publications, California.

Checkland, P. and Scholes, J., 1990. *Soft systems methodology in action*, Wiley. Chichester.

Cornelius, R. 1996. *The Science of Emotion: The Research and Tradition in Psychology of Emotion*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

Crowder, G. 2004. *Isaiah Berlin. Liberty and Pluralism*. Polity .Cambridge.

Dawkins, R 2006 *The god delusion* Black Swan Berkshire.Dryzek, J. 1999. Democratising Rationality in Discursive Democracy. Cambridge.

De Vries, D 2008 *A tool for creating pathways* in McIntyre-Mills et al *User Centric Policy Design to Address Complex Needs*. Nova Science, New York

Dryzek, J. 2000. Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford University Press.

Elkington, J., 1997. *Cannibals with Forks*, Capstone, Oxford.

Flood, R. and Carson, E., 1993. Dealing with Complexity: An Introduction to the Theory and application of Systems Science, 2nd. ed., Plenum, London.

Flood, R. and Romm, N. 1996. *Diversity management: triple loop learning,* Wiley, Chichester.

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.

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.

Giddens, A. 2009. *The politics of climate change*. Polity. Cambridge.

Gore, Al 2007. Assault on Reason. Bloomsbury. London.

Gould, C. 2007 Transnational Solidarities Journal of Social Philosophy vol 38 No 1 148-164.

Greenfield, S. 2000. *The Private life of the Brain: Emotions, Consciousness and the Secret of the Self.* John Wiley and Sons. New York.

Habermas, J., 1984, *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Beacon, Boston.

Habermas, J., 1984. The Constitution of society. Polity Press Cambridge

Habermas, J. 2001 *The Postnational Constellation*. Politcal essays. Polity. Cambridge

Haraway, D. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The reinvention of nature.* Free Association Books. London.

Hardin, G 1968 *The Tragedy of the Commons* Science, 162:1243-1248.

Held, D. McGrew, A. Goldblatt, D. and 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. Oxford.

Held, D.et al 2005.*Debating Globalization*. Polity Cambridge.

Irwin, T., 1985. *Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics* translated with Introduction and notes Hackett, Cambridge University Press.

Kahane, A. 1992. The Mont Fleur Scenarios: What will South Africa be like in the year 2002. Deeper News vol. 7 Number 1 republication of The Weekly Mail and Guardian Weekly

Kickert, W.JM, Klijn, E.H. and Koppenjan, J.F.M. 1999 Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector. Sage. London.

Koestler, A. 1978. *Janus: A summing up*. London. Hutchinson

Koestler, A. 1967 *The Ghost in the Machine*. London. Hutchinson.

Churchman Series, Vol. 1. Springer. London.

McIntyre-Mills, J. et al 2006a, *Rescuing the Enlightenment from Itself: Critical and Systemic Implications for Democracy.* C.West

McIntyre–Mills, J., 2006b, 'Molar and Molecular Identity and Politics', in Van Gigch, J., with McIntyre-Mills, J., *Wisdom, knowledge and management,* Vol. 2, Springer, New York, Boston, London.

McIntyre-Mills, J. et al 2006c *Systemic Governance and Accountability: working and reworking conceptual and spatial boundaries.* Springer. London, Boston. Vol. 3 of C.West Churchman Series.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2007a. "Ethics, Boundaries and Sustainable Futures". Plenary paper. *Proceedings of the 13th Australian and New Zealand Systems Sciences Conference*, Systemic Development: Local Solutions in a Global Environment. Auckland, New Zealand, 978-0791688-9-5.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2007b. The Hijab and Systemic Governance: Transnational Policy Making and Human Rights. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 24: 37-58.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2007c. Challenging economic and religious fundamentalisms: implications for the state, the market and 'the enemies within' *International Journal of Applied Systemic Studies* 1(1): 49-67.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2008a User-centric design to meet complex needs. Nova Science, New York.

McIntyre-Mills, J and De Vries, D 2008b Open democracy supported by governance based on expanded pragmatism and testing out ideas *14th Australian and New Zealand Systems Sciences Conference (ANZSYS),* Edith Cowan, Perth, 1-2 Dec

McIntyre-Mills, J, De Vries, D. and Deakin, J. 2008c Participatory Democracy based on User-centric Policy Design to Address Complex needs in Kane, L. and Poweller, M. Citizenship in the 21st Century. Nova Science, New York.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2008d Systemic Ethics: Expanding the Boundaries of Rights and Responsibilities *Systems Research and Behavioural Science,* Vol. 25: 147-150

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2008e New directions for social wellbeing through extending deliberative democracy to enhance participation. Paper presented at International Systems Sciences Conference, Madison, Wisconsin. ISBN 978-1-906740-00-9

McIntyre-Mills, J. Bausch, K, Christakis, A and De Vries, 2008f 'How can we Break the Mould? Democracy, Semiotics and Regional Governance beyond the Nation State. *Systems Research and Behavioural Science, Vol. 25: 305-321*

McIntyre-Mills, J,. and De. Vries, D. 2009a How Lemmings on wheels can make a U-turn'. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*. Accepted in April, proofs in press.

McIntyre-Mills, J. 2009b Contributing to peace through participation to support unselfish feed forward to the next generation of life *Action Learning and Action Research Journal*, Vol .15. No 1: 2-43.

Midgley, G. ,Ahuriri-Driscoll, A. , Foote,J., Hepi,M. , Taimona,H. , Rogers-Koroheke, M, Baker,V. Gregor, J, Gregory, W. , Lange, M. , Veth, J. , Winstanley, A., Wood, D. 2007 Practitioner identity in systemic intervention: reflections on the promotion of environmental health through Maori community development. Systems Research *and Behavioural Science* Volume 24, Issue 2 , Pages 233 - 247

Midgley, G. 2000. *Systemic Intervention: Philosophy, Methodology, and Practice*. Kluwer. New York.

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.

National Economic/ALGA, 2002, *State of the Regions Report*, by P. Brain, National Economic Director and C. Shepl, ALGA, published by Australian Local Government

National Economic/ALGA, 2003, *State of the Regions Report*, published by Australian Local Government Association.

Nussbaum, M, and Glover, J. 1995. *Women, Culture and Development: A study of Human Capabilities*. Oxford. Clarendon Press

Nussbaum, M. 2001. *Upheavals of thought: the intelligence of emotions*. Cambridge. University Press.

Nussbaum, M., 2006. Frontiers of justice, disability, nationality and species membership, Harvard University Press, London.

O Grady, P. 2005. *Meet the philosophers of Ancient Greece*. Ashgate. Aldershot.

Odum, H.T. 1996. *Environmental Accounting: Energy and Environmental Decision Making*. Wiley. New York.

Pierre, J., ed., 2000, *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy*, University Press, Oxford.

Putnam, R.1995 Journal of Democracy, 6(1): 65-78.

Rosenberg, S. W. 2002. *The Not so Common Sense: Differences in How People Judge social and Political Life*. Yale University Press. New Haven

Singer, P., 2002. *One World: The Ethics of Globalisation*, The Text Publishers, Melbourne.

Standards Australia 2004 Risk *Management: AS/NZS 4360:2004. Standards Australia*, Sydney

Stern, N, 2007. *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge University Press

Vickers, G 1983 *Human Systems are different*. Harper and Row, London.

Wadsworth, Y. (2008a). Is it safe to talk about Systems Again Yet? Self Organ-ising Processes for Complex Living Systems and the Dynamics of Human Inquiry, *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, **21**(2): 153-170.

Wadsworth, Y. 2008a. Is it safe to talk about Systems Again Yet? Self Organ-ising Processes for Complex Living Systems and the Dynamics of Human Inquiry, *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, **21**(2): 153-170.

Wadsworth, Y. 2008b. Systemic Human Relations in Dynamic Equilibrium, *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, **21**(1): 15-34.

Wenger, E. 1998. Communities of Practice: learning, meaning and identity, Cambridge University Press. . Communities of Practice: learning, meaning and identity, Cambridge University Press.