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PROLOGUE

Why should humanity care if the powerful choose to ignore and exclude the powerless when making governance decisions? We argue that caring for the other and the environment is both idealistic and pragmatic. Idealism and pragmatism are one. Moving from pragmatism to idealism is not difficult once we appreciate the 'boomerang affect' (Beck 1992) of cruelty, wastefulness and greed.

This work on governance, democracy and international relations explores and creates opportunities for building capacity in not only weak states (as suggested by Fukuyama 2004), but instead identifies ways for strong states to address ‘the enemy within’, rather than merely ‘dealing with the other’ as nations or civilizations or imposing communitarian solutions (Etzioni, 2004, Huntington, 1996) that are not based on participatory design processes.

C. West Churchman (1913-2004).
(Photograph From the Churchman Family Collection).
C. West Churchman Legacy and Related Works

JOHN P. VAN GIGCH, Series Editor, Professor Emeritus, California State University, USA.
JANET MCINTYRE-MILLS, Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management. Editor of Volume 1

This is the first volume in a series that aims to commemorate the work of C. West Churchman (1913-2004), one of the important thinkers within the last century. The defining characteristics of his writing and his work are his humility and compassion, expressed in the poetry of a human being who loved all that is beautiful in this world. He tries to be open to the diverse ideas of all people and respectful of all living things. Ackoff and Jamshid Gharajedaghi stress that the “world is a mess” and that we can draw on West Churchman for better designs to enhance governance. By working across conceptual boundaries through multidisciplinary work and conversation that is inclusive of differences, we can make steps towards rescuing the so-called ‘Enlightenment’ from itself through more democratic questioning by those who are to be at the receiving end of the decisions. Aleco Christakis, Norma Romm and Janet McIntyre stress in their contribution to this volume that he helps to liberate our thinking from working within the boundaries of one discipline and they make a plea for the practical ideal of working with ideas and working across disciplines, in order to enhance social and environmental justice.

The texts to be published in this series which is entitled: C.W. Churchman’s Legacy and Related Works, will consist of volumes submitted by the members of the systems community who wish to honor West and his professional achievements. Churchman was a pioneer and his works continue to guide us, because he showed us the way to address problems in a manner that had not been done before. He contributed a great deal to pioneering the systemic approach.
For those who were fortunate to know him personally we remember him as a gentle man. He never volunteered his own opinion and asked questions to invite (and incite) you to think and to consider the issues carefully and with passion. Around 1978, in a Foreword to John van Gigch’s book (*Applied General Systems Theory*, Harper and Row, 1974, 1978) he wrote:

"Note that a ‘good’ question is not simply a query followed by a question mark. If the question does not ignite in you to the point of becoming a burning issue - one deeply felt - it is not a good question; on the other hand, if the ignition burns you up, the question is simply disastrous. The artistry of fire is to ignite and burn intensely without destruction."

His turn of phrase is poetic while right to the point. It is typical of all his writings. His work remains relevant and guides us as we tackle the issues of the world requiring attention. On behalf of the system community and beyond, we dedicate the first volume edited by Janet of Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia, as well as all the volumes to follow, to honor the Churchman Legacy. We invite prospective authors to submit their proposal to us and help to make this celebration vibrant. You can also contact the publisher.

We would like to ensure a range of authors is represented in the proposed volume and that many interpretations are included. In the spirit of collaboration we would like to ensure that the contributions that are drawn together are presented in an egalitarian manner and that anyone contributing will be attributed collectively^1^.

The starting point for this volume is the challenge posed by Pierre (2000) in his edited volume on the potential for regional governance based on people working together across the boundaries of nation state governments^2^.

The catastrophic tsunami that impacted directly on East African states, Maldives, Indonesia, Syri Lanka, Thailand, India and the many international tourists has created an international governance challenge. Early warning systems for prevention, disaster relief and reconstruction requires an international response by networks of concerned people and also coordination by the United Nations.

The desire for social and environmental justice is the motivation for shared rights and responsibility, rather than state power. Throughout history

---

^1^ Any royalties for this volume will go to Streetwise, a project for homeless children in South Africa. The Pretoria Streetwise Branch started in 1988 as a Participatory Action Project with colleagues and many dedicated volunteers and supporters.

^2^ The European Union is discussed in terms of its potential for another way of governance that is ‘de-centred’ and ‘de-institutionalised’ and based on a sense of shared policy direction, rather than on state power.
people have networked, but the scope of networking has expanded in a digital and global world. Where there is a will, people can network across organizations, they can advocate and bring pressure to bear through social movements. Thus ordinary people can play a role in making and re-making futures outside organizational contexts (McIntyre-Mills 2000, 2003). Nevertheless existing structures place enormous limitations on life chances and cannot be dismissed without the vision, creativity and determination of individuals and diverse groups of concerned people.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 1: THE CONTRIBUTION OF WEST CHURCHMAN TO SUSTAINABLE GOVERNANCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JANET MCINTYRE-MILLS

*Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management, Volume Editor.*

The central questions are: What is good governance? How can governance support a sustainable future? What does this mean and what are the issues associated with striving for accountability to self, others (including sentient beings) and the environment?

The diverse knowledges and experiences of current and future generations of stakeholders need to be considered in making policy decisions. Testing out ideas is a task for all those who are to be at the receiving end of a decision, but so is advocacy and accountability to those who are voiceless. This is the basis of a reworked enlightenment and democracy that draws on the insights of many.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This book provides many conceptual tools that can enhance our ability to design *inquiring systems* that are more mindful and more conscious of both our rights and responsibilities to humanity and to all sentient beings. At a certain point life becomes self-aware. As conscious caretakers we have a role of achieving balance between the freedoms of individuals and the need for collective responsibility for social and environmental justice that uses consciousness to address sustainability.

---

In this collected works and in the volumes that follow, we explore the implications of Churchman’s (and other related) ideas for better governance, risk management and systemic accountability by exploring the boundaries of our thinking and asking questions.

The purpose of this volume is to argue that ideally a revised enlightenment and democracy needs to be seen not so much as a static universal law, but as a dynamic structure and process for balancing the eternal paradox that:

*On the one hand:* openness to debate and to other ideas and possibilities is the basis for both the ideal form of revised enlightenment process of testing and for ideal forms of democracy and

*On the other hand,* for openness to occur there has to be some trust that voicing new ideas will not lead to subtle or overt marginalisation of oneself or one’s associates.

The West and the East face the challenge of preserving this openness and trust and redressing the imbalances in wealth and power caused by centuries of brutal colonization, modernization and globalization that is largely based on the single bottom line (see Elkington’s 1997 critique) of profits in competitive markets, that support hegemony, rather than on a multiple dynamic awareness of socio-cultural, political, economic and environmental factors that (when considered together) support a sustainable future.

Philosophy and communication to span the divides across Foundationalism, non-Foundationalism and anti-Foundationalism (Romm 2004, pers. comm., Romm, 2001a, b, 2002) is needed as a means to share thinking and to co-create responses. Communication based on respect (in the sense explored by Derrida and Habermas, 2003) is perhaps more important than ever as the basis for governance, international relations, peace studies and socio-environmental policy. The paradox, namely that openness and sharing ideas (the idealist version of democracy and a transformed Enlightenment approach) requires trust. Trust in turn requires openness and sharing ideas. The leap of faith required to address this paradox and to develop resonance and trust through respectful communication is where spirituality, religions and the sciences touch fingers across the divide across subjective, objective and intersubjective experiences of the world.

In 1971 Churchman wrote *The Design of Inquiring Systems* and developed tools for theoretical and methodological literacy. The five basic systems are as follows:

- Leibnizean logic based on rationalism and fact nets
- Lockean empiricism based on data
- Kantian idealism based on universal law
- Hegelian dialectic based on thesis, antithesis and synthesis
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- Singerian pragmatism based on contextual ‘sweeping in’ and unfolding – an application of the dialectic, which he tended to apply. But understanding the other approaches is useful for bridging the divides across our understanding of the world.

In 1979 he wrote *The Systems Approach and its Enemies* and developed reflexive thinking based on the dialectic of unfolding values and ‘sweeping in’ multiple variables. We need to recognize ‘the enemies’ within and without- these include: ‘politics, religion, morality and aesthetics’, to use West Churchman’s (1979: 23) concepts, so as to examine the human potential for hubris, which means thinking we can behave like a God who has all the answers for other people. Instead we have to accept that we all have potential to make contributions.

West Churchman stresses that we can never find a total or absolute solution and for that matter we are unlikely to ever know the full extent of any system, but nevertheless we need to try to appreciate other ways of seeing (Vickers, 1983). The greater the use of critical reflection and participatory design for governance and international relations, the better the local and international policy outcomes will be.

In 1982 he wrote *Thought and Wisdom* in which he suggests that the system of interest should in fact start with ‘unfolding’ values and ‘sweeping in’ (in the sense used by Churchman, 1979 a, b, 1982 who drew on Singer) multiple variables (social, cultural, economic, political and environmental) within the context of the inquiry. Dialogue and conversation to achieve resonance and radiance of shared meaning was a focus for this work. Critical reflection is the basis for testing out ideas and finding out how they are perceived, because the closest we can get to truth is through dialogue (Mclntyre-Mills, 2000, 2003, 2004).

1.2 DIALECTICAL PRAXIS

Our thinking and practice needs to be dialectical or open to many ideas. For this to occur we argue that we need to recognize ‘the enemies’ within - these include: “politics, religion, morality and aesthetics”, to use West Churchman’s (1979a, page 23) concepts, so as to examine the human potential for hubris, which means thinking we can behave like a god who has all the answers. Instead we have to accept that we all have potential to make contributions.

contributions and that we are all gods, in so far as we have some potential to construct our futures with others. We can construct our futures through dialogue and praxis (McIntyre-Mills 2000, Rhodes (in Pierre ed. 2000, Rhodes 2003). Governments competing with globalization have argued for the inevitability of markets. But people have diverse ideas and narratives about the nature of the state, the nation, market and society.

Our starting point is that people can make choices within social, cultural, political economic and environmental contexts. Shaping life chances is never unidirectional or linear. Complexity can be recognized as we work and re-work the relationships across self-other and the environment. Improving governance requires accountable thinking and praxis to ensure policy decisions that are mindful of structures and processes within specific contexts. We need to be able to make generalizations, based on statistical (nomothetic) patterns, but we also need ‘thick description’ (Geertz 1975) (ideographic details) based on rich case studies and stories.

West Churchman argues we can never find a total or absolute solution based on a total understanding of the system, but we do need to try to see wider horizons. Systems thinking, like all thinking, can be used creatively or destructively if it leads to the hubris of certainty, hence our approach is critical, reflexive and thus systemic. Space, time, mindfulness, willfulness and human creativity provide contextual variations to policy decisions. Critical reflection can help if we look both inwards and outwards. The appreciation of a system requires understanding or at least being prepared to strive for a glimpse of the expanse of the system. Current thinking that is limited within the enlightenment framework can cast a shadow of hegemony.

This work on governance, democracy and international relations explores and creates opportunities for building the capacity of people to think and practice systemically, in terms of open systems. International relations and governance need to be based on openness and transparency. Closure in terms of conceptual and geographical boundaries can lead to entropy (see Flood and Carson, 1997) that means the dissipation of energy. This is as important for policy makers and administrators in weak states (as suggested by Fukuyama, 2004), as it is for policy makers and administrators in strong states. We try to identify ways for both so-called strong states and weak states to look at ‘the enemies within’. This requires looking inwards, not merely outwards, in order to ‘deal with the other’ as nations or civilizations or to impose communitarian solutions (Etzioni, 2004, Huntington, 1996).

Our system of interest starts with ‘unfolding’ values and ‘sweeping in’ (in the sense used by Churchman, 1979a, b, 1982 who drew on Singer) multiple variables (social, cultural, economic, political and environmental) within the context of the inquiry. Critical reflection is the basis for testing out ideas, because the closest we can get to truth is through dialogue (McIntyre-Mills, 2000, 2003).
This volume draws on C. West Churchman to re-work 'a design of inquiring systems' to promote systemic international relations and policy for socio-cultural and environmental justice. In so doing it celebrates the contribution of West Churchman by working with some of his ideas developed in *The Design of Inquiring Systems* (1971), *The Systems Approach and its Enemies* (1979) and *Thought and Wisdom* (1982). These works can help rescue the Enlightenment from itself through mindfulness. He stressed that dialogue with many stakeholders helps greater self-reflection and self-knowledge. Limited consciousness can make us focus on just the waves (continuums) or just the particles (categories) of energy, to use a well worn natural science analogy. We need to be aware of both in physics and even more so as policy makers and managers.

Rescuing the Enlightenment agenda from its failings through open debate to try to achieve greater transparency (and awareness) ought to be the ideal for democracy, based on working on our conceptual and geographical boundaries. Moving from pragmatism to idealism is not difficult once we appreciate the continuums or (at the very least) the feedback loop or 'boomerang affect' (Beck, 1992) and realize that democracy needs be reconsidered as being about human and environmental rights - not merely about bounded or categorical citizenship and nationalism. The UN Aarhus convention of 2001 makes a useful step according to Florini (2003) towards vigilance that spans borders of any one state, nation or region. This is a far cry from the present situation of war, cover-ups and toadyng to the powerful - nationally and internationally - within the so-called coalition of the willing warring groups.

We need to do more than merely balance the state, market and society. This can only occur if people redraw conceptual and geographical boundaries of identity and politics.

---

5 This requires a capacity to think critically and systemically. This goes beyond the mere 'tolerance' of diversity in a societal sense (see Derrida in his discussion with Borradori, 2003 entitled: Philosophy in a Time of Terror). Derrida (in conversation with Borradori, 2003) argues that international relations need to be based on an engaged and respectful dialogue and 'hospitality', not merely cold tolerance, because this is insufficient for building rapport that is vital for 'generative communication' (see Banathy 2000, Freire 1982). Singer (2002: 192-197 taking issue with Rawls, 1999) argues for a sense of responsibility for individuals, not merely social tolerance of groups. Peoples living in developed nations need to take responsibility for what war, poverty and pollution does to individuals and they cannot say that it is the responsibility only of elected leaders. Power is recognized as being central to (what passes for) knowledge when decisions are taken that affect ordinary and less powerful people. Ordinary people need to take on their rights and responsibilities through participatory governance.
1.3 SYSTEMIC APPROACH

A sense of self-assurance, self importance and then arrogance based on knowledge rooted in power can result in physical, structural and emotional violence to others (Foucault & Gordon, 1980, Foucault 1967, Foucault, 1979) that will impact on internal politics and international politics in the long term. West Churchman’s (1971) Design of Inquiring Systems together with his later works on systemic thinking (1979 a, b) and conversation (Thought and Wisdom 1982) contribute to building our capacity to explore the shortcomings of the Enlightenment.

Most human beings have values, whether they are aware of them or not. ‘Religious, political, moral and aesthetic’ values can limit our vision. Churchman calls these values ‘the enemies within’. Seeing the enemy as ‘the other’, without seeing ‘the enemy within’ is the challenge posed by West Churchman. It can lead to worsening international relations and environmental management. Psychological and socio-cultural stereotyping can be based on misunderstanding and projections of our own ‘shadow’, to use a Jungian concept. Occidentalism is the projection of the idea of fundamentalist West ruled by greed and the market. Orientalism is the projection of the fundamentalist east ruled by religion (see Baruma and Margalit, 2004). ‘Unfolding’ our own values and ‘sweeping in’ (West Churchman, 1982) the social, cultural, political and environmental context can be helpful as a means to enhance governance capacity.

We need to strive to co-create (see Reason and Bradbury, 2000) frameworks with others. We work with, rather than within West Churchman’s Design for Inquiring Systems, in order to ‘address the enemies within’, to borrow the poetic phrase from ‘The Trojan Women’, a play by Euripides. West Churchman like many other Western scholars was a white, middle class American male. My own experience is also shaped by my place of birth and life chances as a white, middle class Australian female, born in Bulawayo Zimbabwe. I strive systemically (within the limits of my experiences in a range of contexts) to include experiential learning and the radical working of the hyphens across self, other and the environment.

\[\text{In Thought and Wisdom, West Churchman refers to religion, morality, politics, and aesthetics as ‘the enemies within’.}\]

\[\text{For a discussion on the shadow within, see for example Jung, C.J., 1972, Translated by Hull, R., Mandala Symbolism from the Collected Works of Jung, C.G. Bollingen Series, Princeton University Press.}\]

\[\text{The contributions from colleagues who are critical and systemic thinkers such as Bob Flood, Norma Romm, Gerald Midgley, and John van Giegh have helped with this task.}\]

\[\text{See McIntyre- Mills, 2003, for a discussion on identity and meaning}\]

\[\text{An attempt is made to discuss the implications of working across self-other and the environment in more detail in a manuscript entitled: Working and reworking the}\]
The potential value of West Churchman’s work is that he addresses and combines multiple frameworks, in order to create a more systemic or ecological approach by working with frameworks, rather than within any one Enlightenment framework. Nevertheless he is aware of the limitations of any framework and strives to both recognize and address ‘the enemies within’ as they are ‘the vipers within the nest’\(^{11}\) that can paradoxically liberate the paradigm from its own shortcomings. The potential danger of his work is that it is limited to Western Enlightenment thinking. His *Design of Inquiring Systems* draws on Leibnizean logic, Lockean notions of representation, Kantian idealism, Hegelian dialectics and the pragmatism of Edgar Singer. A greater capacity to work beyond conceptual boundaries is needed, in order to enhance governance and international relations. Bateson (1972) in his work *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man’s (sic) understanding of himself* stressed that sustainable futures rested on an ability to think beyond the limits of one framework. Being able to move from Level 1 thinking within one paradigm to making comparisons across paradigms, at Level 2 and then being able ‘to leap beyond’ (see Banathy 1996,2000) the confines of our learning at Level 3, is a precursor to better governance and international relations.

Limited frameworks can and do lead to hegemonic thinking and practice, as history demonstrates. Questioning and openness (based on both hospitable and respectful conversation) holds the key to sustainable governance and international relations (Borradori in conversation with Habermas and Derrida, 2003). Discursive and respectful communication is needed for sustainable governance and international relations. We need to make connections to heal the divides within and across the self, the other and the environment. This work draws on the work of West Churchman and the related works of other thinkers and practitioners\(^{12}\).

According to a Rawlsian utopia (1999), ‘reasonable’ and ‘decent’ people are able to think beyond the boundaries of the nation state in terms of human rights. In his utopia immigration issues, the creation of nuclear weapons,
catastrophic natural disasters and waging war simply would not occur. But practical political and social philosophy (after September 11th 2002 and the tsunami disaster of 26th of December 2004) needs to work with the reality of terror and hegemony and the possible dangers of trying to understand it in terms of limited social, cultural, political, economic or environmental frameworks.

1.4 CONSCIOUSNESS IS ABOUT CONNECTIVITY

Greenfield (2000) stresses that consciousness is about connectivity across multiple neurons within the highly plastic human brain. If consciousness is emergent from the complex interplay of matter, body and brain within our environment, then perhaps we could argue that 'The Private Life of The Brain' is not so private after all. In some ways all consciousness is individual and unique, but consciousness is a product of an open, not a closed system of perception. Consciousness is a recursive experience that no two people can experience in exactly the same way argues Greenfield (2000). But paradoxically, it is only by both our shared understanding of language, experiences and our willingness to converse (with warmth and respect) that we can make meaning with one another.

Our individuality and perceptions are a product of personal experiences, life chances and our emotions. To the extent that we can be mindful of the many factors that shape us, we can think about our thinking and design options for better governance for the future. Our emotions are part of what make up our experience. We can be ourselves when we are conscious and aware of our emotions. Emotions are part of sentience or feeling. Feeling is not the preserve of the human animal. Consciousness is a continuum, according to Greenfield (2000) from inorganic to organic life.

"Unlike machines, young children and nonhuman animals have very poor cognitive abilities, yet we attribute to them sentience...a portfolio of feelings..."(Greenfield, 2000: 32)

Haraway (1991) however argues that we could extend our ability to think through using technology, and thus we are in the process of extending the continuum of consciousness to include the human–machine interface, namely the cyborg. Our values will determine the extent to which social and environmental justice is achieved.
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1.5 AN OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

The two introductory papers by John van Gigch and Ken Bausch talk specifically about 'the enemies within' and their implications for our thinking. They make us human and my paper stresses that these need to be owned and acknowledged and not merely projected onto others.

John van Gigch addresses The Systems Approach And Its Enemies, one of the most important works written by C.W. Churchman. At the same time, we - the contributors to this volume re-interpret CWC’s ideas to search for the way to rescue democracy from its failings. Hegemony is a characteristic of western democracy of which we are not proud. Current events Post 9/11 underline this. We encounter countervailing forces (enemies and adversaries) that are bent in disrupting our efforts and contradict our premises. We will expand CWC’s list of enemies to show that the possibility of conflict(s) is ever present and must be anticipated. We suggest reaching consensus on the basis of the use of the logic of an inquiring system (a CWC original idea) where agreement instead of conflict can be developed.

Most importantly West Churchman stresses that questions are as important as answers to a revised Enlightenment agenda. It is certainly vital for rescuing democracy.

It is these characteristics that enable his thinking to stand the test of time. Questioning is important for working the boundaries of our own maps of reality. Questioning helps us to consider our own ideas and to rework them in the light of ideas from others. Drawing a line between them and us needs to be considered in terms of differences that are couched in terms of categories such as age, gender, language, nationality or religion. Questioning or unfolding our own values and ‘sweeping in’ a wide range of social, cultural, political, economic and environmental considerations can enhance understanding others and ourselves. Whether we engage with differences as educators, in the course of business or as managers or policy makers in the public or private sector we need to find a way to strive for better understanding and for compassion.

This revised Enlightenment agenda provides a basis for a democracy that does not “cast a shadow of hegemony over the powerless”, because it is “first and foremost open to all - irrespective of age, gender, level of education, income, culture or any other category that can be used to justify inclusion or exclusion or competition for resources. Most importantly Churchman is mindful of our rights and our responsibilities - not merely as citizens, but as compassionate caretakers of the environment of all living things and all sentient beings”.

Ian Mitroff discusses practical ideas to make us more accountable in all walks of life.
Churchman talks of ethics, beauty and compassionate praxis. He is a practical man with suggestions that can make a difference if they are applied in a world that is greatly in need of better decision-making (see David Mathews’s chapter) at a local, national and international level.

To our mind, his more lasting legacy will relate to his interest in important the philosophical issues that have been neglected. We are referring to the underlying morality (or lack thereof) of management, social and international affairs. The Enron collapses of the world would not have occurred if the business world were less based of unbridled greed, individualism and the destructive mentality of ‘survival of the fittest.’ If the business world were to embrace a design that is inclusive and based on many different stakeholders, it would be able to do better risk management (see van Gigch, Christakis, Ferris, McIntyre-Mills and Carugati’s chapters).

We are also referring to the proclivity of Western nations to settle conflicts through violence, intimidation and bullying. Van Gigch stresses that Churchman was interested in the poverty of the disadvantaged and of the dispossessed wherever they may live, the inequality of social classes and, in general the morality of our actions toward each other and other fellow human beings (See John van Gigch, Ackoff and Gharajedaghi).

Decision-making based on looking inwards at ourselves and exploring the scope of problems through good communication are vital for better governance (see Bausch, McIntyre-Mills, Morgan and Romm).

1.6 ADDRESSING COMPLEXITY

The world comprises many different life chances and economies. For some it is eking out a subsistence existence and coming to terms with giving up a nomadic existence, as land is lost. For some it is fleeing war and living in camps/or incarcerated with or without refugee status. For some it is surviving the trauma and loss caused by natural disasters. For some it is entering into the world of commercial agriculture and trying to maintain a foothold in the market based economy that is controlled by the WTO. For others it is entering the postindustrial age of being knowledge workers. Life chances vary within and across national boundaries.

The reality of the boundaries caused by lack of education, citizenship and discrimination cannot be denied in a world where the global markets know few limits and where information technology can empower the literate, the numerate and those with access to electricity or at the very least access to mobile phones.

To talk of the “borderless information economy” (Long, 2002) makes sense for some, for others it is still a dream. The challenge for good
governance and international relations is not only to try to redress the divides between those who can access digital economy and those who cannot. But to consider the challenge of different ways of knowing, different ways of being and earning a living that are now presented simultaneously as options. Globalization has changed the speed with which information flows and it has changed our sense of who we are in space and time. Some have increasing access to information through small radios, battery operated, and televisions or through mobile phones. Long (2002, 6), an advocate of borderless information, talks about the advantages to coffee farmers on the Ivory Coast who can use mobile phones to decide when to market their commodities. This is advantageous to them. Similarly he talks about Sri Lankan tea growers who learned a new and more efficient method to dry their tea by using the Internet. This information was translated and shared through local radio. Nanadorn (2004, pers. comm.) reporting on his doctoral research into the role of communication technology in Thailand rural communities talks of the potential and also the challenges. On the one hand, local teachers receive Internet training, but they do not have phone lines, so they are unable to practice their skills.

The challenge in the future will be to provide affordable phone lines and power supply to enable people to access resources, not only water and sanitation (Long, 2002). These tools for learning and communication whilst useful for supporting and deepening democracy are insufficient for good governance. The Internet does not prevent totalitarianism, but it can aid transparency even if its participation potential remains limited. Florini (2003) talks optimistically about the new options e-governance provides. Conceptually however information is not the same as knowledge as Long (2002) argues in his paper Beyond Traditional Boundaries: Government in the Information Age. If it were there would be more cause for optimism. Greenfield has argued that the challenge is to work with difference and different ways of knowing (Thinker in Residence in Adelaide, Australia, public lecture 2004), in order to enhance governance. We also need to add international relations. Making links across bits of data, creating information and then accepting that information will be perceived differently (because we are human) is a useful starting point for good governance and good international relations. For ordinary citizens it means learning to live with difference and realising the value of diversity. For public policy makers at the local, national and international level it means learning to think about thinking and translating this into practice.

Different ways of knowing and working towards shared knowledge can be about finding ways to work with different domains. Habermas and Derrida (in Borradori, 2003) talk of the challenges of communicating and making knowledge by thinking and practising in ways that are underpinned by philosophical rigour.
Unfortunately we need to do more than respond to "the borderless nature of information" (Long, 2002: 8). Firstly, borders do exist for information flow - they are poverty and lack of literacy and numeracy and powerlessness. Secondly information and knowledge cannot be conflated (as Long suggests on page 7). The boundedness of knowledge is an issue for governance. It requires more than so-called knowledge management to enhance connections. In fact the term suggests that knowledge and information are the same and that directing the flow of the right information for the task is the challenge. Secondly, we need to acknowledge that many kinds of knowledge exist and finding ways to communicate across knowledge domains is the challenge. Habermas (1984, 2003 in conversation with Borradori) suggests respectful communication is the way forward. Derrida (in conversation with Borradori, 2003) suggests that not only do we need respectful communication, in order to co-create shared domains of understanding, we also need to accept that people will see things differently. Spaces for conceptual difference need to be respected to the extent that they do not undermine the rights of others.

1.7 REWORKING DEMOCRACY AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Our starting point is the need for better communication- not just as a means to an end, namely closer representation of people and their ideas, but also because communication is the very essence of life. The book provides examples and discusses the learnings for re-working governance. Examples and their implications for social and environmental justice are discussed. Conversation that is discursive is essential for democracy, governance and better international relations.

“Democracy, in its most basic sense of majority decision making, requires that those who decide be sufficiently alike that they will respect the will of the majority. Global-level decisions will inevitably have a highly restricted agenda, set by what the majority of the richest nations will tolerate, and a very reduced role for the world’s publics. The difficulties of global democracy should make us pause when considering the rhetoric about democracy at the national level, for that too, despite the belief that nations are relatively homogenous political communities, is subject to similar limitations as to both agenda and participation. The question is whether one needs to rethink some of the assumptions of democratic theory in order to find ways to widen the scope of accountable government by consent.” (Hist in Pierre 2000, 17).
To be classified as a non-citizen makes one aware of the benefits of citizenship. Being an asylum seeker in 2003-4 in Australia or a black South African in 1988 would make one realise that human dignity is given only to citizens, not to non-citizens. The nation state protects only some not others. Perhaps democratic rights based on rights and responsibilities of citizens need to be expanded to all human being who can be free to the extent that they do not undermine the rights of others (including sentient beings).

The Enlightenment thinkers such as Locke and Kant can be perceived by some as racists, because of the support of slavery, in the case of the former, or the belief in their own superiority, in the case of the latter (Bernasconi, 2003). We need to see that liberal thinking has coiled within it a serpent, which is appropriate, if the Enlightenment is to be rescued or wrested from itself.

For the dialectic to become a means of liberation, it needed to be reworked first by Marx and the members of the Frankfurt School who emphasized the systemic importance of both culture and economics in shaping life chances. It now needs to be reworked to add the environment, identity and consciousness.

Rawls (1999: 61, 71) talks of ‘tolerance’ for diverse societies, provided they are based on consultation and are thus ‘decent hierarchical’ societies, even if they are not democratic in the ideal sense that he uses the word\(^\text{14}\). His ideal utopia only embraces societies in good standing who accept the principles of decency, defined in terms of health care, equality of opportunity in education and training, decent distribution of wealth, long term opportunities for work and support (as a last resort from government) and public financing of fair and open electoral system (Rawls, 1999: 50).

These decent hierarchical societies are prepared in his scheme to accept the principles of human rights; because they are defined in minimalist terms and they are not equivalent to citizenship rights in so-called liberal democracies. These human rights according to his schema include:

1. Their fulfillment is a necessary condition of the decency of a society’s political institutions and of its legal order. 2. Their fulfillment

\(^{14}\) Rawls (1999, 73) points out “Of course, a decent hierarchical society has never had the concept of one person, one vote, which is associated with a liberal democratic tradition of thought that is foreign to it, and perhaps would think as Hegel did that such as idea mistakenly expresses an individualistic idea that each person, as an atomistic unit, has the basic right to participate equally in political deliberation”. Rawls cites the following from Hegel’s Philosophy of Right (1821) as follows: “...The citizens come to the scene as isolated atoms, and the electoral assemblies as unordered inorganic aggregates, the people as a whole are dissolved into a heap. This is a form in which the community should never have appeared at all in undertaking any enterprise; it is a form most unworthy of the community and most in contradiction with its concepts as a spiritual order. Age and property are qualities affecting only the individual himself, not characteristically constituting his worth in the civil order”.
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is sufficient to exclude justified and forceful intervention by other peoples, for example, by diplomatic and economic sanctions, or in grave cases by military force. 3. They set a limit to the pluralism among peoples.” (Rawls, 1999: 80).

In his revised work Rawls (1999: 30-34) argues that decisions should not always be made on the basis of even a ‘thick veil of ignorance’, because:

“Whether our conjecture is borne out will depend on whether you and I, here and now, can, on due reflection, endorse the principles adopted. Even if the conjecture is intuitively plausible, there are different ways of interpreting the reasonable and the rational, and of specifying restrictions on reasons and explaining the primary goods. There is no a priori guarantee that we have matters right” (Rawls, 1999: 30).

The notion of a ‘veil of ignorance’ is based on the biblical notion that a law should be conceptualised in such a way that the makers of the law would be prepared to abide by it and he also argues that all those who make the law should be party to the process. This is the basis of liberal law. Rawls argues that it could lead to problems, because it does not provide space for decent hierarchical peoples, who have decent, but hierarchical consultation structures. He uses an example of an ideal Muslim society that has different ideas. His argument is a useful step in rescuing the Enlightenment from itself. The next step needs to be to extend his notion of tolerance to include a sense of hospitality to all (see Derrida in Borradori 2003) and to expand the notion of human rights to notions of social and environmental justice, because these policies are both idealistic and pragmatic. Thus they are sustainable. Also his work is not extended to individuals who suffer at the hands of nation states and his work also denies the need for a welfare net, other than an open opportunity and basic healthcare. He does not link the environment with sustainable development. A Law of Peoples (Rawls, 1999), according to Singer (2002) needs to be reworked contextually in such a way that discursive democracy takes into account what it means in the everyday life of ordinary ethical people who live in a world where nationally defined rights and responsibilities need to be reshaped to take into account international human rights and responsibilities of individuals.

In a volume 3 of this Book Series, a model of sustainable, systemic governance and international relations is developed through working and reworking the boundaries (both conceptual and geographical) across:

---

15 I am grateful for a comment by Shaun Young, 2004, pers comm. agreeing that Rawls is reshaping his argument in line with changed ideas of governance and boundaries.
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1. Community governance
2. Third Way governance partnerships across public, private and volunteer sectors and developing community involvement
3. Corporate governance
4. Federal European Union models for regional and international governance. 1-4 are all interconnected and complementary.

We stress that diversity and creativity is fostered to the extent that it does not undermine the diversity of others. The central argument is that those at the receiving end of a decision need to be part of the process. British Third Way approaches pertain to citizenship rights. This means finding a way that is in between complete reliance on the state and complete reliance on the individual to address needs at the national level such as challenges of health, education and employment. This model emphasizes democratic solutions within the boundaries of the state. European federalism for the European Union emphasizes a balance between local and wider governance (national and international complementarity). It potentially incorporates United Nations policy and human rights. This model expands governance to the regional and international context. Some of the essential characteristics of good governance are:

- Openness to many people and many ideas,
- Representation of all the stakeholders in decision making,
- Advocacy for the voiceless, sentient beings based on compassionate observation, signaling and/or sign language\(^\text{16}\),
- Listening to and responding to needs,
- Respectful communication,
- Working across organisations and across sectors (health, education, employment, for example)
- Forming responsive team approaches in response to issues,
- Holding in mind many issues, not just single issues.

One of the techniques for achieving better governance at the local, national and international level is expanding the concepts of accounting and accountability to incorporate: social, cultural, political, economic and environmental indicators. The fluid structure and process for governance involves working, learning, doing and communicating with:

- People within the community and civil representatives
- Elected representatives
- Corporate structures to link public, private and non government organisations

It also involves continuous review with all the stakeholders. We need to build social, economic and environmental indicators into planning. The vision, mission, planning, implementation and monitoring need to take many factors into account, in order to do good accounting and accountability for governance.

The goal is to achieve a well-rounded approach to governance that addresses multiple perspectives and voices on human rights. Multiple voices and advocacy for the voiceless are required to develop a ‘design of inquiring systems’ that strives to consider – not on the basis of experts - but on the basis of the ideas, experiences and advocacy for all those who are at the receiving end of a decision. Power and knowledge in the Foucaultian sense is no longer the preserve of the expert in this critical and systemic approach. Thus this volume (and the ones that follow) strives to extend the potential of the ‘Enlightenment’ and democracy to think beyond citizenship rights and to address the rights of non-citizens and the powerless, including sentient beings.\(^{17}\)

Human beings need to move from the hubris of certainty that is tied to a culture or to a favoured scientific paradigm to embrace an appreciation of diversity. The will to be compassionate can be addressed through mindfulness, but also through our desire for a sustainable future for those we care about.

Perhaps this openness will help to rescue democracy and the Enlightenment from hegemony. The potential of democracy can be restored through realizing the value of diversity for creativity. Diversity should be valued to the extent that it does not undermine the rights of others.

Knowledge systems are nested and form dimensions, rather than meta hierarchies in a hegemonic sense. The volume of papers will make the case that good governance is about thinking and practice that can lead to a better balance of social, cultural, political, economic and environmental concerns to ensure a sustainable future for ourselves and for future generations. We also need to consider transnational human rights, not only nationalist rights of citizens. The whole system is the context of social and environmental justice. A revised democracy and Enlightenment needs to redress the hegemony of power and exclusion.

\(^{17}\) This is developed in Working and Re-Working the Geographical and Conceptual Boundaries of International Relations and Governance, Volume 3 (also see Volume 2 for the chapter on Molar and Molecular Identity and Politics).